DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 100 554 RC 008 204

TITLE	Equal Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People. Hearings Before the Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Ninety-third Congress, First Session on the Role of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People in Providing Equal Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People (July 11 and 19, 1973).
INSTITUTION	Congress of the U.S., Washington, D.C. House Committee on the Judiciary.
REPORT NO	Serial-32
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	89p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility of original document
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC Not Available from EDRS. PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Role; Civil Rights; Educational Opportunities; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Federal Programs; Needs; *Organizations (Groups); *Spanish Speaking; Speeches
IDENTIFIERS	*Cabinet Comm Opportunities Spanish Speaking People; CCOSSP

ABSTRACT

The statutory purpose of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish Speaking People, established in December 1969, is twofold: (1) to assure that Federal programs are reaching all Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed Americans, and (2) to seek out new programs which may be necessary to handle problems unique to such persons. On July 11, 1973, the Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary met to hear testimony from the Cabinet Committee's Chariman. Focus was on the Cabinet Committee's role in providing equal opportunity for Spanish-speaking people in accordance with its statutory mandate. On July 19, 1973, the Subcommittee met once again to hear testimony from representatives of Spanish-speaking organizations. The focus was on ways in which the Subcommittee could assist the Cabinet Committee in carrying out its mandate and its responsibility to the Spanish-speaking community. Among the witnesses were representatives from the: (1) National Council of La Raza, (2) Spanish Speaking Coalition on Domestic Affairs, (3) La Causa Comun, (4) Mujeres en Accion, and (5) Raza Association of Spanish-Surnamed Americans. (NQ)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

ED100554

RECEIVED JAN 13 1975 NMSU E.R.I.C.

HEARINGS

BEFORE THE

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS SUBCOMMITTEE

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-THIRD CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

ON

THE ROLE OF THE CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE IN PROVIDING EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

JULY 11 AND 19, 1973

Serial No. 32

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 100 554
CG 008 244

Printed for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1974

0002

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey, *Chairman*

HAROLD D. DONOHUE, Massachusetts
JACK BROOKS, Texas
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER, Wisconsin
DON EDWARDS, California
WILLIAM L. HUNGATE, Missouri
JOHN CONYERS, JR., Michigan
JOSHUA EILBERG, Pennsylvania
JEROME R. WALDIE, California
WALTER FLOWERS, Alabama
JAMES R. MANN, South Carolina
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland
JOHN F. SEIBERLING, Ohio
GEORGE E. DANIELSON, California
ROBERT F. DRINAN, Massachusetts
CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York
BARBARA JORDAN, Texas
RAY THORNTON, Arkansas
ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN, New York
WAYNE OWENS, Utah
EDWARD MEZVINSKY, Iowa

EDWARD HUTCHINSON, Michigan
ROBERT MCCLORY, Illinois
HENRY P. SMITH III, New York
CHARLES W. SANDMAN, JR., New Jersey
TOM RAILSBACK, Illinois
CHARLES E. WIGGINS, California
DAVID W. DENNIS, Indiana
HAMILTON FISH, JR., New York
WILEY MAYNE, Iowa
LAWRENCE J. HOGAN, Maryland
WILLIAM J. KEATING, Ohio
M. CALDWELL BUTLER, Virginia
WILLIAM S. COHEN, Maine
TRENT LOTT, Mississippi
HAROLD V. FROEHLICH, Wisconsin
CARLOS J. MOORHEAD, California
JOSEPH J. MARAZITI, New Jersey

JEROME M. ZEIFMAN, *General Counsel*
GARNER J. CLINE, *Associate General Counsel*
JOSEPH FISCHER, *Counsel*
HERBERT FUCHS, *Counsel*
HERBERT E. HOFFMAN, *Counsel*
WILLIAM P. SHATTUCK, *Counsel*
H. CHRISTOPHER NOLDE, *Counsel*
ALAN A. PARKER, *Counsel*
HOWARD C. EGLIT, *Counsel*
MAURICE A. BARBOZA, *Counsel*
DONALD G. BENN, *Counsel*
FRANKLIN G. POLK, *Counsel*
ROGER A. PAULEY, *Counsel*
THOMAS E. MOONEY, *Counsel*
PETER T. STRAUB, *Counsel*
MICHAEL W. BLOMMER, *Counsel*
ALEXANDER B. COOK, *Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL RIGHTS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

DON EDWARDS, California, *Chairman*

JEROME R. WALDIE, California
PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland
ROBERT F. DRINAN, Massachusetts
CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York

CHARLES E. WIGGINS, California
ROBERT MCCLORY, Illinois
M. CALDWELL BUTLER, Virginia
TRENT LOTT, Mississippi

ALAN A. PARKER, *Counsel*
RUTH G. ROBINSON, *Assistant Counsel*
ARDEN B. SCHELL, *Assistant Counsel*
LINDA CHAVEZ, *Staff Analyst*
MICHAEL W. BLOMMER, *Associate Counsel*

0003

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearings held on—	
July 11, 1973	1
July 19, 1973	49
Testimony of—	
Fierro, Manuel, president and executive director, Raza Association of Spanish-Surnamed Americans	76
Frankel, Raquel, Spanish-Speaking Coalition on Domestic Affairs	53
Keyser, Cheryl, Mujeres en Accion, presented by Raquel Frankel	63
Ramirez, Dr. Henry M., chairman, Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People, accompanied by Reynaldo P. Maduro, Executive Director; Robert S. Brochtrup, Director of Congressional Operations; Moe Garcia, Special Assistant to the Chairman; and Bette Boston, Consultant Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People	2
Vasquez, William P., president, La Causa Comun, accompanied by K. W. May, staff assistant	55
Zermeno, Alex, assistant executive director, National Council of La Raza	50
Additional material—	
COSSP liaison with member agencies	5
Flores, John A., national chairman, National Spanish-Speaking Coalition on Domestic Affairs, prepared statement	54
Hidalgo, Dr. Hilda, prepared statement	65
IMAGE (evaluation of Civil Service Commission 16-point program study and status report), July 13, 1973	82
Minutes of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking People, August 5, 1971	28
Review of the Annual Report—Fiscal Year 1972 of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People	59

0004

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1973

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CIVIL RIGHTS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:02 a.m., in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Don Edwards [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Edwards, Drinan, Rangel, and Wiggins.

Also present: Alan A. Parker, counsel; Michael W. Blommer, associate counsel; and Linda Chavez, staff analyst.

Mr. EDWARDS. The subcommittee will come to order.

The Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary meets today to hear testimony from the Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People.

As part of our continuing oversight responsibility in the area of civil rights, this subcommittee has had an ongoing interest in programs which serve the Nation's Spanish-speaking people. Last year the subcommittee held a series of oversight hearings on the Federal employment problems of the Spanish speaking and on the educational problems of Spanish-speaking children. Today we continue our inquiry into the problems of Spanish-speaking Americans.

The Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People was established by Public Law 91-181 on December 30, 1969. It succeeded the Interagency Committee on Mexican American Affairs created under the previous administration.

The statutory purpose of the Cabinet Committee is twofold: to assure that Federal programs are reaching all Spanish speaking and Spanish surnamed Americans and to seek out new programs that may be necessary to handle problems unique to such persons. Members of the Cabinet Committee include the secretaries or heads of those executive departments and agencies whose programs most directly affect the Spanish speaking as well as the Attorney General, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and the Equal Employment Opportunity Commissioner most familiar with the problems of Spanish-speaking Americans. The Chairman of the Committee is appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate.

0005

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Cabinet Committee is required by law to meet at least four times a year and to issue at the completion of each fiscal year a report on its activities for the preceding year with whatever recommendations it deems appropriate.

In addition, the law establishes an advisory council of nine representative Spanish speaking persons to be appointed by the President and whose function it shall be to advise the Chairman of the Cabinet Committee.

The focus of our hearings today will be the Cabinet Committee's role in providing equal opportunity for Spanish-speaking people in accordance with its statutory mandate. We are pleased to have with us the Chairman of the Cabinet Committee, Dr. Henry M. Ramirez. Dr. Ramirez, a distinguished educator from the State of California, was nominated Chairman of the Cabinet Committee on August 3, 1971, and confirmed on November 9, 1971.

Dr. Ramirez is accompanied by Mr. Reynaldo P. Maduro Executive Director, Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People; Mr. Robert S. Brochtrup, Director of Congressional Relations; Mr. Moe Garcia, Special Assistant to the Chairman; and Mrs. Bette Boston, consultant.

We welcome all of you here this morning.

Mr. Wiggins?

Mr. WIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to again welcome Dr. Ramirez to our subcommittee.

As I have explained on earlier occasions, Dr. Ramirez has been, from time to time, a constituent of mine, depending upon which congressional boundaries existed at the moment. He is a longtime friend for whom I have a great deal of admiration, who has brought to this position a great understanding.

We are happy to hear your testimony this morning.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, I, too, welcome you, Dr. Ramirez, and members of your staff.

The subcommittee has its responsibilities for Spanish-speaking people in the United States as does your committee, and we are interested in talking with you and hearing about the work you have been doing since the last time we had the pleasure of talking with you at our hearings.

Do you have a statement, Dr. Ramirez?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to be here, and I thank you very much for the invitation to discuss opportunities for Spanish-speaking Americans in our country.

TESTIMONY OF DR. HENRY M. RAMIREZ, CHAIRMAN, CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE; ACCOMPANIED BY REYNALDO P. MADURO, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR; ROBERT S. BROCHTRUP, DIRECTOR OF CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS; MOE GARCIA, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE CHAIRMAN; AND BETTE BOSTON, CONSULTANT, CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

Dr. RAMIREZ. I believe that the work this Committee has done is terribly necessary and essential for our people. I believe that the work

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that is being done by Congress in this respect—and the Federal Government—is very necessary for our people and is critically important for that reason, because this Committee and the subcommittee on Civil Rights Oversight are involved in the same basic area.

I welcome the opportunity to be here with you and your committee and its distinguished members to discuss these matters of opportunities for Spanish-speaking people.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you very much, Dr. Ramirez.

Dr. Ramirez, you write a report each year, according to the requirements of the law; is that correct?

Dr. RAMIREZ. That is correct.

Mr. EDWARDS. On the work you have done, as mandated by statute, do you feel you have had a successful fiscal year which ended June 30, 1973?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Mr. Chairman, the work of trying to bring opportunity as guaranteed by the 14th amendment, the executive orders, and civil rights laws to Spanish-speaking Americans who find themselves at the bottom of the socioeconomic level is so monumental. No one in his best presence of mind could claim success in having brought opportunity to Spanish-speaking Americans, as they should have.

Mr. EDWARDS. Your report that you issued this year, Dr. Ramirez, it came 11 months after the end of the fiscal year.

Was there any particular reason for this delay, 11 months, in the issuing of your report?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I cannot think of any particular reason. There are many reasons why it takes a long time to issue these reports.

I was presented with two drafts. The first one, I believe, was finished in 6 months. I did not like it. I sent it back to be redone. I did not like the second draft. So, it took a lengthy time to put the report out. That is very similar to the amount of time that it took to publish reports at the Civil Rights Commission. I did these while I was working there in the field of education and researching Mexican American education in the Southwest. It took, sometimes, 2 or 3 years to issue those very difficult reports, because I was often not happy with the first, second, third, or fourth drafts——

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, Dr. Ramirez, this report came out 11 months after its due date, and it consists of 19 pages: 5 pages of statistics and 14 pages to describe your work the previous year.

In fiscal year 1971, you issued 120 pages in really great detail describing the work. Why did you, this time, issue such a very short, cursory report as opposed to the practice of the previous year?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, the original drafts were much lengthier than I wanted to present. I wanted to present a report that was more readable. I felt that it's better to do it in fewer pages if you can say it in fewer pages.

So, we compressed it. We worked very hard to put it out in the last year, and we are working now to present our next report as soon as possible. I think this next one will come out soon.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, it did take a long time, 11 months, to get out a 19-page report.

Do you think it fairly describes your activities, of the Cabinet Committee?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not know that we have a due date on these annual reports. It says "as soon as possible." And, in this case, it was as soon as we could get it done.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, do you think that it fairly describes your activities?

You had a budget of nearly $900,000. Do you feel that this 19-page report fairly describes how the money was spent?

This is a report to the Congress, not generally to the public, although it is published. I presume that it is a mandate—that it is a report to the Congress and the public.

Do you think your report fairly describes the activities of your committee?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Mr. Chairman, I believe there is a full range of items that we could discuss that would describe our work.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, the report describes two projects in which you were involved in 1972, project blue, and project alfa.

Now, what was project blue?

Dr. RAMIREZ. The Government departments and agencies to a great extent have not enforced the civil rights efforts in relation to Spanish-speaking Americans. For example, some commissions began to get involved in this area just a few years ago despite the fact that they were set up in 1957. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission took 5 years—and a walkout by Chicanos—to get a Spanish-speaking commissioner. Even today, San Francisco and Los Angeles are not up to par in employing Spanish-speaking people. The other agencies set up to look over these areas like the Office of Civil Contract Compliance has had very little emphasis on Spanish-speaking people despite the fact that the law to oversee these establishments has been there since 1961.

They receive funds from the Federal Government to make sure the aerospace industries and the private sector do not discriminate. When I came to this job from the Civil Rights Commission, one of my first goals was to bring about a Spanish-speaking presence in HEW, Housing and Urban Development, Commerce, Labor, Treasury, et cetera. The members of this committee set out to carry forth the presence by establishing task forces in each agency which would carry forth the work of providing more opportunities for Spanish-speaking Americans.

These agencies have civil rights divisions to see to it that these things happen. Spanish-speaking Americans were not involved in these activities. We just were not there. We made a massive effort with the few staff members that we had to penetrate these agencies via task forces.

It is very difficult to move these agencies. It is a very short time in which to have made these changes, in view of the fact that we have had executive orders from the time of President Roosevelt to bring these changes about for black citizens. It has taken some 30 years for this to happen, although administration after administration supported these changes. Our effort, beginning in September of 1971, was to try to bring that presence for the Spanish-speaking Americans which had not existed up to that time for us.

These task forces were set up in the Department of Labor, where many guidelines—think papers, position papers—were developed

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

which addressed themselves to the Spanish-speaking people. As a result a task force of community persons was set up by the Secretary of the Department of Labor.

In the Department of HEW a task force was set up which began to develop an action plan.

In the Department of Agriculture a task force was set up which did develop an action plan. We have the action plan of the Department of Agriculture.

This is an action plan that has been adopted by the Department of Agriculture as a result of task forces working therein. Here is a copy of the action plan that the Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the task force that they helped set up of their own members with our names, on how to provide opportunity for Spanish-speaking Americans, developed.

We set up a task force for the Civil Service Commission. To a great extent we feel the implementation and the institutionalizing of the 16-point program was effected by this task force at the Civil Service Commission. The Federal personnel manual letter No. 713-18 that institutionalized the 16-point program as part of the procedures of the Civil Service Commission was developed.

These are examples of what happened in this Project Blue in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Edwards. In your report, you do not describe Project Blue other than generally.

Did you send staff members to each of these departments to establish the guidelines and the machinery within the agencies to implement the 16-point program in this last fiscal year?

Is that what you are testifying project blue consisted of?

Dr. Ramirez. We assigned our staff members as liaisons with the task forces that secretaries or agency heads established within their own departments in order to pursue matters dealing with Spanish-speaking Americans.

Mr. Edwards. Which staff members?

Dr. Ramirez. We developed a format which dealt with three basic areas: employment, procurement and contract compliance.

Mr. Edwards. Which staff member worked, for example, with the Civil Service Commission?

Dr. Ramirez. It is Mr. Ruiz presently. I can supply the other names for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Edwards. I think we would appreciate the names of the employees who constituted these liaisons with the task forces within the agencies.

[The information referred to follows:]

CCOSSP LIAISON WITH MEMBER AGENCIES

CCOSSP liaison	Member agency	Member agency liaison	Activity
Ralph Ruiz	Civil Service Commission	Hilario Costales, Director, Spanish-speaking program	As CCOSSP Federal Employment Coordinator, I assist in providing equal employment opportunities for Spanish-speaking Americans within the Federal Government. In this capacity, I was designated liaison representative to the Civil Service Commission to collaborate with the 16-point program director in the development and implementation of recruiting programs affecting the Spanish-speaking.

5000

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CCOSSP LIAISON WITH MEMBER AGENCIES—Continued

CCOSSP liaison	Member agency	Member agency liaison	Activity
Alejandro Becerra	USDA & HUD	USDA? Bill Seabron, Deputy Director, OEO; Jerome Shuman, Director of Equal Opportunity; Frank B. Elliot, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Administration, HUD; Sam Simmons, Assistant Secretary for Equal Opportunity; Ignacio Lopez, HUD Coordinator for Spanish-speaking; Tom Jenkins, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Equal Opportunity.	With respect to these agencies, our main efforts have been seeking to have both agencies develop plans of action on employment, contract compliance, procurement, data collection, and program delivery. USDA has developed such a plan while HUD is considering the formulation of one. All pertinent community requests related to these 2 agencies are referred to our liaison contacts or to appropriate officials in these agencies. From time to time we have submitted recommendations to these agencies on various topics—USDA: information and questions on USDA's ability to reach migrant through its food and nutrition programs; HUD: recommendations with respect to HUD's study on the evaluation of housing programs and development of new ones to meet the housing needs of the country.
[illegible] Cardenas	OE, HEW	OE Liaison: Gil Chavez, Office of Spanish-speaking Divisions.	I have worked as an informal liaison with the Office of Spanish-speaking Americans under the direction of Gil Chavez at the U.S. Office of Education. We have discussed a number of topics on education as they related to the Spanish-speaking. I have inquired as to the possibility of participation in the Spanish-speaking Caucus of DHEW, but no decision has yet been reached.
Rex Fuentes	HEW	HEW Liaison: Manuel Carrillo, Office of Spanish-speaking Affairs.	I was assigned to serve as liaison from CCOSSP to HEW and specifically the Office of Education. My primary responsibility was to maintain communication with the agencies and to monitor activities as set out in Project Blue. Project Blue was structured to carry out the responsibilities of data collection, employment, programs, procurement, and contract compliance. During the 7 mos. between February and August 1972, as liaison to HEW and OE the following activities occurred: (1) Worked closely with offices of special concern at HEW and OE. (2) Worked closely with the HEW Spanish-speaking caucus. (3) Concentrated on employment of Spanish-speaking at HEW. (4) Established a task force on higher education. 5 OE persons were detailed to CCOSSP for a period of 60 days.
Ilde DeLeon	SBA and DOL	SBA: Paul Everett, Director of Labor Relations and EEO; James Smith, Director of Professional and College Recruitment; Esther Sholl, Chief of Employment Office. DOL: Dr. X Mena, Job Corp.; Dr. Fred Romero, Associate Manpower Administrator; Ms. Dannie Jones; Mr. L. Garza; Mr. L. Miranda.	DOL: Maintain liaison with the Department of Labor and the Office of EEO. They provide me with current information and guidelines concerning manpower programs and manpower revenue sharing. This has been more of a personal relationship with different individuals within the Department since I have worked with DOL and maintained a good working relationship with these individuals. No recommendations have been made as of yet with an exception to the EEO office. This was done by meeting with the new Assistant EEO Director who is Spanish-speaking and now he could be effective in this position within the DOL. No recommendations have been made to the Manpower Administration for we have only been analyzing legislation and the effects it will have on the Spanish-speaking community. Recommendations will soon be forthcoming in the final draft from the CCOSSP manpower task force.
Charles Gaston	SBA, OMBE Department of Commerce	SBA: Nick Ortiz, Assistant to the Administrator; Richard Sadowski, Director, Reports, Management Division; Hermit Culver, Information Officer of SBA; Eric Weinman, Attorney; OMBE: Milton Wilson, Assistant to Director of Capital Development; Ramon Romero, Director of Capital Development.	These 2 agencies have been most helpful in the development of our goals and strategies toward their implementation. A close working relationship with key individuals in these 2 agencies has facilitated our understanding of programs that are of benefit to the Hispanic-American, in particular, I refer to the MESBIC, 8(a) set aside, direct loan and Equal Opportunity loan programs of the 2 agencies.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CCOSSP LIAISON WITH MEMBER AGENCIES—Continued

CCOSSP liaison	Member agency	Member agency liaison	Activity
Federico Perez-Molina	Census Bureau, Department of Commerce	Census Bureau Liaison—Edward Fernandez, Special Assistant to Population Division Chief	Meetings with officials on the 1970 census undercount of the Spanish-speaking, and to discuss plans of action for improving data collection instrumental to the production of a more accurate count and description of the Spanish-speaking in the 1980 census. Recommendations have been made that the information about the Spanish-speaking in the midperiod (1975) census be developed from responses to questionnaires that should be included in 100 percent of households. We have tried to have this agency publish more statistical information on the social and economic status of the Spanish-speaking people. Other activities related to this agency and under the Chairman's direction have been: Meetings at the Cabinet Committee with Spanish-speaking demographers to discuss means to gain accurate population data for the Spanish-speaking. We have assured that a highly qualified Spanish-speaking demographer would head up the analysis section that affects Spanish-speaking persons in the census. We have assisted in the placement of a full-time Spanish-speaking recruiter to identify, recruit, and place Spanish-speaking in the Bureau. Also, we have conducted extensive conferences on how to improve the posture of the Census Bureau vis-a-vis the Spanish-speaking.

Dr. RAMIREZ. It is so difficult to report on these items that we work on. I imagine that they will be more and more comprehensive and more and more extensive. And at some point, one must determine to cut it off.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, your committee and our subcommittee have a larger responsibility in this area.

As you recall, from our last series of hearings, this subcommittee's unanimous report last year was very critical of the various agencies of the Federal Government in the employment practices of the Spanish-speaking people.

You are 3 percent of the Federal employees today—or perhaps we have a higher figure now of Spanish-speaking people, either Puerto Rican or Chicano or Cuban or other Spanish speaking—and that figure, proportionately, is not improving. As a matter of fact, we are doing worse now than we did previously. According to the latest figures we have, there has been a net increase of 700 Spanish-speaking people this last year when 4 or 5 years ago it was double that.

In your report, in all fairness, Dr. Ramirez, you said that these Agencies cooperated to a certain extent. Insofar as project blue is concerned, your report does not indicate that it was a success or is a success; is that correct?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I indicated to this committee, Mr. Chairman, before, that anyone claiming success in bringing full opportunities to Spanish-speaking people in our Government today, whether it be legislative, judicial, or executive, would just have to have his head examined.

Mr. EDWARDS. In March of last year, you were kind enough to come to the subcommittee, Dr. Ramirez, and in describing the 16-point program you said: "The Cabinet Committee"—and I am quoting—"The Cabinet Committee does not feel there has been substantial progress."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As a matter of fact, over this year as compared with last year you have 4 percent, at the best, better record of employment of Spanish-speaking people than in the previous years, in the Federal Government.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Mr. Chairman, this is why the work this committee does is so terribly important for our people. I think that the work this committee does is of deep importance in providing opportunities to our people. At that time, you will recall I made some recommendations on how to improve our situation in the agencies.

I believe that history shows that most of those recommendations in one way or another have been adopted and put into force.

Mr. EDWARDS. Would you provide us at a later date copies of recommendations and some kind of description of the type of work that you do with these agencies?

The report does leave us in the dark, Dr. Ramirez.

Dr. RAMIREZ. I will be happy to supply that for the record.

Mr. Congressman, I would like to point out that in relation to the 16-point program, the progress has not been substantial. I believe it bothers many Spanish-speaking persons that this program is being called a failure because a distinction is not made.

In 1964, Congress passed a very necessary, comprehensive civil rights law; they did so in 1957; they did so in 1965. These laws, these acts, in themselves, have not been called failures. The implementations of these laws is where there has to be some failure. Since 1957, 1964, for the Spanish-speaking people, that civil rights law of 1964 has been a terrible failure—I would call it a dismal failure, because we just were not included. In fact, to a great extent, those laws were not intended for the Spanish-speaking people. The 16-point program had to be invented as a plan so that finally we might be able to participate in those laws. Although these were great laws their implementations were failures for us. That is why the 16-point program had to be invented. That is why the 16-point is also so young, but it is moving, and it is progressing, and it is having some progress for our people.

For example, I just came back about a month ago from Colorado Springs and from McClellan Air Force Base in California where I addressed Air Force personnel who are involved in equal opportunities. These persons were from various bases throughout the Western and Pacific areas. Many of them were 16-point program coordinators, many of them were women coordinators, and most of them equal-employment opportunity coordinators. I brought to them the importance of implementing the 16-point program. For the first time in history, they became aware that now they had to deal with the Spanish-speaking people.

Here, it is 1973, almost 10 years after the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and these equal opportunity employment coordinators were just becoming aware that they had to deal with Spanish-speaking people. It is a sad thing that it has happened—so late.

Mr. EDWARDS. I have no more questions, but I would like to yield to Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. WIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to ask a few preliminary questions, Dr. Ramirez, and then probably we will get into more detailed questions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The chairman set the tone for this hearing by indicating that we were concerned about the Cabinet committee meeting its statutory mandate, and it would appear from the reading of that statute that one of its principal purposes is to reach Spanish-speaking Americans and involve them, appropriately, in the activities not only of the Federal Government but to the extent that you may do so in the private sector as well. I can imagine that that is a very difficult job, and it involves great difficulties in moving in an established bureaucracy, but the chairman indicated a moment ago that in meeting this goal that your performance has been less than satisfactory and suggested that there has been a decline in Spanish-speaking employment in the Federal Government.

Is that, in fact, the case?

I have before me your annual report, and at the bottom of page 13 and then on page 14 there are statistics.

Mr. EDWARDS. Since my name was mentioned, would you yield for a moment for correction?

Mr. WIGGINS. Sure.

Mr. EDWARDS. I said that the rate of increase has declined; the last year there were 700 more Spanish-speaking employees in the Federal Government than in the year before. But that is a decline from an over 2,500 net increase in the previous years. I believe that that is what I said.

Mr. WIGGINS. I accept that correction, Mr. Chairman, or, at least that clarification.

It would seem that, Dr. Ramirez—and you correct me if this is not the case—that the total Federal employment is declining but that total Spanish-speaking employment notwithstanding is generally increasing; is that true?

Dr. RAMIREZ. That is correct.

We have received a report from the Civil Service Commission that indicates that in a period of time when the total work force in the Federal employment sector dropped, there was a rise in the employment of Spanish-speaking people.

Mr. WIGGINS. Well, do you conceive it to be your responsibility to try to effect that percentage in terms of increasing the employment opportunity for Spanish-speaking people among the various Federal agencies?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, it is, Mr. Congressman.

In fact, I would just like to point out additionally, that in the area where people make $11,000 and up, there was a 39-percent increase of Spanish-speaking persons.

Mr. WIGGINS. Well, percentages are deceptive, because we are talking only about a relatively few people.

I think the only conclusion we can draw here is that the trend is to hire more Spanish speaking in the Federal Establishment, but that the rate of increase is not what you would hope for or any member of this committee would hope for; is that true?

Dr. RAMIREZ. In no way is the rate what the Congress would like, this committee would like, what the Spanish-speaking people would like, and what the administration would like. It is just not there yet.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. Wiggins. Do you have any recommendations for statutory change which this subcommittee might sponsor or actions this subcommittee might take which would help you in reaching the goal you indicated you want and, certainly, which this subcommittee wants which would lead to more Spanish-speaking people in the Federal Establishment?

Dr. Ramirez. Mr. Congressman, I would recommend that in the pursuit of the work of this committee that careful attention be given and information be acquired from other agencies that are involved in this work to see what they are doing to bring about the employment of more Spanish-speaking persons, what they are doing to provide for opportunity for Spanish-speaking persons.

I believe they should take a look at agencies such as the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, agencies such as the FBI, agencies such as the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Civil Rights Commission—I also think a very close look should be given at the equal opportunity effort at the Pentagon. These are areas where so many of our people are employed. The work of this committee, which is so very important, would help us in the work we are doing, and we could move forward in a very cooperative way. If we did these types of activities, it would help Spanish-speaking people out tremendously.

Mr. Wiggins. I am certain that I speak for other members of the committee when I say that we want to cooperate, and that is that we would give serious consideration to your recommendations.

Now, Dr. Ramirez, as one who works at the total problems of Spanish-speaking people in this country, I think you would have to be almost overwhelmed in trying to get a handle on those problems: how to identify what the problems are and what to do about them. Surely, you have had that type of frustration. How have you met that problem in your Committee and how have you cataloged it in terms of Spanish-speaking people?

Dr. Ramirez. Well, No. 1: I would like to go back in history to these laws or Executive orders beginning in 1939 with President Roosevelt and every President since then.

The Interagency Committee was formed because we were not involved with all of these laws, beautiful laws but failures in terms of Spanish-speaking people.

This administration raised that organization to the rank of Cabinet level, to move these things along faster, because again, those laws still were not working for us.

As we proceed to try to advise the other agencies on how to provide opportunities for Spanish-speaking people, it is very necessary for the Chairman to know what he is talking about. It is very necessary for the Chairman to visit every major Spanish-speaking area of concentration in this country and to be in touch with all Spanish-speaking leaders. He needs to be aware of the issues, the changing patterns, and the change in needs that are arising. He needs to be intimately aware of how our community is hurting, to see how it can move ahead, not only in the Federal Government but within the State, local, and private sectors.

It is necessary for the Chairman and his staff to bring that information back to Washington so that he can then sit with those persons

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

who have the ability to provide these opportunities. With this knowledge we are able to speak on a point with authority based on solid experience. The Chairman should not sit back in Washington and concoct these things. As you distinguished gentlemen know. You must go out there to learn how you can best serve your constituents. You cannot do this from Washington.

The Chairman must do these things so he can come back and advise the various Government officials as to what the specific needs are in given areas or regions across the Nation.

Mr. Wiggins. Before we leave the area of possible legislative change, the Cabinet Committee is up for reauthorization, as you know. Are there any statutory changes or mandate changes whatsoever that you would recommend which this committee should consider which would make your organization more effective?

Dr. Ramirez. Yes; there are statutory changes that I believe should be made, to make the Committee stronger so that it can more consistently provide opportunities for Spanish-speaking people.

I have indicated many times that it is impossible for this adjunct of the Government to bring a change in the needs of our people. It is impossible for this small staff to make a significant difference in our socioeconomic status of the Spanish-speaking people. We need the assistance and help of others. Particularly we need Congressmen's wisdom. We appreciate the assistance given to us by Senator Montoya, Congressman Chet Holifield and Congressman Ed Roybal. They are the ones who carried the ball in Congress when legislation was presented and the ones who saw that changes would have to be made.

We have submitted recommendations to the White House for consideration of legislative change. We would very gladly accept your invitation to work cooperatively with the Committee on how to improve on our legislation even more.

Mr. Wiggins. Well, the committee does not wish to step on the toes of the authorizing committee, and I do not want you to submit anything to us that you have not already submitted to them.

As one member of this committee, I would like to have the benefit of those recommendations, if it does not interfere with the protocol in respect to the Government Operations Committee.

I hope that you would submit any written recommendations that you could make available.

Dr. Ramirez. I would be very happy to.

Mr. Wiggins. And I will yield my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Edwards. Mr. Drinan.

Mr. Drinan. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Mr. Ramirez, for coming.

I want to open up on the question of possible involvement of the Cabinet Committee in the Nixon reelection campaign, and I am not certain that you are too familiar with this subject, but I would like to have your comments on what involvement, if any, was there in this whole thing.

It is known that Mr. Finch was the liaison man, and, then, apparently, Mrs. Anne Armstrong, counsel for the President, was the liaison to the President and accusations and allegations have been made.

I wonder if you want to comment on it?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, I do not know how to comment on a general question like that, Congressman.

Mr. DRINAN. What, if any, political influence was there from the White House to the Cabinet Committee over a period of months?

Dr. RAMIREZ. By "political influence," what do you mean, Congressman?

Mr. DRINAN. I think you are familiar with the memo that came from CREEP to your group and that it is documented in press clippings here, and I just want to know what response you may have given.

I am quoting from a memo to you from Alex Armendariz, June 19, 1972, and it has been pointed out by press clipping that it is very insulting to the Spanish-speaking Chicanos here. It is obviously a highly political document, and it is to you, a public official, from the Committee to Reelect the President, and it is asking you to give a reply by the morning of June 27, 1972.

To this memo of June 19, what reply did you give?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I did not give any reply, Congressman.

Mr. DRINAN. Were there any further requests from the Committee to Reelect?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I received items like that from time to time, for your information, but I did not get involved in replying to memos of that type.

Mr. DRINAN. By what right did they think that you would get involved?

Why, on June 19, did this memo come from CREEP to you if they thought you would not get involved?

This is an extensive memo.

Did they have reason to think that you would, in fact, cooperate and corroborate with them?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I think we would have to ask the sender of the memo.

Mr. DRINAN. Was this the first of the memos, or did you have memos prior to this?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I received memos of different types and variety.

Mr. DRINAN. Would you like to submit those?

I would like to request, Mr. Chairman, that we have every memo from the Committee to Reelect to put into the file of this hearing.

[The committee requested this material from the Committee to Re-Elect the President and maintains the information provided in committee files.]

Mr. WIGGINS. You know, Mr. Chairman, I suspected that these hearings might involve this issue.

For the life of me, I do not understand the relationship to this subcommittee. If we are going to get down to a question of asserted political involvement of Dr. Ramirez as the focus of our hearing, I would think that it probably should have been announced as such so that all the members and Dr. Ramirez could prepare to respond to this political question.

I think that would be fair to him and certainly fair to me. I had assumed that we would confine our inquiry to the effectiveness of the Cabinet Committee as a mandate imposed upon it by statute and not become an investigative hearing with respect to alleged political activities on the part of any individuals of any agency.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. EDWARDS. The Chair feels that the mandate of Dr. Ramirez' committee is very clear.

In connection with our oversight responsibility in civil rights, I think it would be entirely appropriate that the committee try to determine how the $900,000 was spent, and I am sure that Dr. Ramirez and his committee can be explicit in describing their activities, and I do not see that the questions of the gentleman from Massachusetts are out of line.

Mr. WIGGINS. I wish to register the observation in the record that, in fairness to our witness, if we were going to have what would amount to an inquiry into whether or not he, as an individual, or the Cabinet Committee as an entity, involved itself in political activities, that the hearings might have been announced for that purpose so that he could prepare to be able to respond to them.

Mr. EDWARDS. The Chair respects your views. The Chair, however, does feel that it is our job to evaluate all of the activities of the committee in order to determine whether or not the legislative mandate of Congress has been complied with and to assist the committee in meeting its requirements.

Both the Cabinet Committee and this subcommittee are involved in the same issue, that is, to help a minority, the second largest minority in our country, which has a large participation in American life.

I think it is entirely appropriate for us to examine in a friendly fashion all of the the activities of the committee.

Mr. DRINAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Ramirez, I would want you to comment upon my question. How many times did the Committee to Reelect sent you memos?

There were memos prior to this one on June 19, I take it?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Congressman, I received several memos. I do not have them at present. These all went into the wastebasket.

I would recommend that CREEP be asked to supply those memos that have been sent.

I would also add that the chairman indicated that this hearing was to see how the committee has spent the $900,000, and that was the direction given in the letter that I received.

However, I noticed that the purpose of the hearing was viewed slightly differently by the Congressional Monitor which indicated that it would refer to activities in the last election. I really become concerned, in view of the fact that we are representing 12 million Spanish-speaking persons and we have here two books of the Civil Rights Commission documenting how badly our people are getting hurt in this country, how badly we are being deprived of our rights. We have so much to discuss along these lines of civil rights enforcement and what we are doing to right the wrong, that I came prepared, distinguished congressmen, to discuss those items.

We are funded to the point where we have 8 cents per Spanish-speaking citizen in our country. I would feel that those are the essential things to discuss.

Mr. DRINAN. I agree with you, but, also, I think it is very essential to vindicate the reputation of the Cabinet Committee in the minds and community of the Spanish-speaking persons and also in the minds of the Congress.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I feel that I must insist that you have received several memos from the Committee to Reelect, and that you do not have them anymore. You did not shred them; you just threw them away.

If I may ask: Did you make any protest that this clearly political document coming to you suggested to you—and they wanted your comment on this. It says that the abortion issue could be used against McGovern by publishing his remarks face to face with the Catholic bishops, particularly Flores; that drugs would be another way to attack McGovern, and religion are strong forces to Chicanos, and drugs strike directly at these. This is acknowledged by Chicanos. And it goes on and says other things about Mr. Humphrey.

Did you protest, that you did not want to receive these things or did you just throw them away?

Did you ever speak to anyone on the phone, from the Committee to Reelect?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I have many friends throughout town——

Mr. DRINAN. Would you answer the question?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I have many friends throughout town, Congressman, and I spoke to members over there as I spoke to Linda Chavez when she was at the Democratic National Committee, as I spoke to Polly Baca when she was at the Democratic National Committee, as I spoke to other members when they were at the Democratic National Committee.

Mr. DRINAN. Dr. Ramirez, would you say that there was a deliberate and concerted attempt, by sending these memos continuously, by the Committee to Reelect to use your Committee for political purposes?

Dr. RAMIREZ. How can I——

Mr. DRINAN. Well, I mean, if they kept sending you memos, they must have wanted to use you.

This is clearly a political memo.

Dr. RAMIREZ. I also met with members from the National Democratic Committee. Does that mean that I would be in political activities with the Democratic Party? Does that mean that I would be in political activities of——

Mr. DRINAN. I have clippings here, many of them indicating that prior to the election the administration, for example, HUD, did, in fact, direct, according to this clipping, $47 million into projects for Spanish-speaking Americans, particularly in Texas and California.

Were you ever consulted about such things?

Dr. RAMIREZ. That would be a direct result, Congressman, of our effort in spending the $1 million for the benefit of Spanish-speaking people in our country. On the first occasion of my meeting with the President on August 5, 1971, I recommended to him that the offices and the services of the Federal Government be made more available to our Spanish-speaking citizens. Most of them are concentrated in the New York area, the Florida area, and there are regional offices in those areas that have funds. Although there are staffs in those areas that can provide services, up to that time the Spanish-speaking Americans were not terribly aware of their presence. These offices and the bureaucrats in those offices were not very aware of the presence of these Chicanos, Cubanos, and other Spanish-speaking citizens in their areas. So, there

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

was not a connection made between people in Government. So, I designed a project called Project Alpha to bring the Federal Government closer to where the Spanish-speaking citizens live. Project Alpha was mentioned in our annual report. As a result of our regional visits almost $50 million was allocated to first-time grantees—people who have never received Federal grants. People received technical assistance from HEW, HUD and OEO to help them prepare proposals. Normally these people could not compete with the professional proposal writers. For the first time they were able to acquire these items. I was very, very proud of having accomplished this. I think that the people who received these funds for the first time in history are very happy that they were able to participate.

Just a week ago I met a young man, a Cubano from Tampa, Fla., who, for the first time, was able to acquire funds from Atlanta, Ga. And there are many Cubanos in Miami who are just now beginning to understand what it is to write a proposal. A year ago, they did not even understand that. They acquired large sums for the first time in history, and that goes on and on throughout the entire country. I am very proud of that, Congressman. Our total cost for that was $15,000.

Dr. DRINAN. I want to yield to my colleague in a moment, Mr. Randel, but let me ask you a few more questions.

You said that you met with the President on August 5, 1971?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes.

Mr. DRINAN. Have you met with him since?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, I have.

Mr. DRINAN. How often?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Oh, about six or seven times.

Mr. DRINAN. And the Cabinet Committee, how often does that meet?

Dr. RAMIREZ. It has met at different times in the years that it has existed. I do not know exactly. I can provide it for the record.

[Subsequent to the termination of the hearing the following information was submitted for the record:]

The dates of the three Cabinet Committee meetings since my appointment were August 5, 1971, April 20, 1972 and July 18, 1973.

Mr. EDWARDS. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. DRINAN. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. You responded, in the questionnaire, to us that the Cabinet Committee met several times in 1970 and two times in 1971 and one time in 1972. You are required by law to meet four times a year.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, Mr. Chairman, and I would say that it should be more often. Many times it is not possible, but the Chairman of the Cabinet Committee meets very frequently with a member of our Committee. He meets very frequently with the heads of other agencies and the secretaries and the assistant secretaries and the under secretaries. He is in constant touch by phone, by letter, and informal meetings with these gentlemen. So, we are not out of touch. Sometimes you get much more done over lunches and breakfasts. We meet to move ahead and try to get opportunities for Spanish-speaking Americans.

I believe that these meetings, these contacts, are on a very frequent basis at this high level, because we have been able to provide for more opportunities for Spanish-speaking Americans.

0019

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Let me repeat an example that I gave a moment ago.

Because of my concern for the 16-point program, I flew out to California and to Colorado with the Assistant Secretary of Defense and the Assistant Secretary of Manpower, for the Air Force. We were able to get many things accomplished as a result of that trip.

Last week I met with the Assistant Secretary for Manpower for the Navy. We are setting the stage so that we can begin to move cooperatively with the Department of Defense to bring opportunities to our people.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not want to pursue the subject and I do not want to take any of the other members' time, but the law does provide that you meet four times a year, and you met three times over a period of 3 years; is that correct?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Do you have any intention to have four meetings a year?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, sir, I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. Could you provide us with the minutes of the three meetings that you did have?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I am not aware of what the legality is, but I will look into what extent substantive items that are discussed at Cabinet meetings are privileged.

Mr. EDWARDS. You have not met at all in 1973?

Dr. RAMIREZ. We have not, but we have a meeting scheduled for next week, which has been scheduled for some time.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Drinan.

Mr. DRINAN. Yes.

When last did you meet with Mrs. Armstrong for some length of time over the business of the Cabinet Committee? And when was she appointed as liaison?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I do not know exactly the date that she was appointed. I can provide that for the record.

Mrs. Anne Armstrong was appointed liaison to the Cabinet Committee shortly after her swearing in which took place on February 2, 1973.

I met with her—I believe it was 3 weeks ago. We meet very frequently. I was just on the phone with her this morning. I was on the phone a couple of days ago with her. We have very close contact.

I feel that because the Chairman of this Committee does not hold a Cabinet level position it is very difficult for him to work at that level. So, very often the Chairman tries to establish contacts with members of the committee on a formal or informal basis. We would like to see that part of the law changed so that the Chairman becomes a member of the peer group.

Mr. DRINAN. What was Mrs. Armstrong's background in Spanish-speaking affairs prior to her appointment?

Does she speak Spanish?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Very well; yes.

Mr. DRINAN. Well, just tell us her background prior to her appointment.

Dr. RAMIREZ. I am not very familiar with her background, but I can supply that for the record.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[Subsequent to the termination of the hearing the following information was submitted for the record:]

ANNE ARMSTRONG, COUNSELLOR TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. Armstrong, a native of New Orleans, has for the past 22 years resided on the Armstrong Ranch, Armstrong, Texas, with her husband Tobin and their five children.

She is a graduate of Foxcroft School, Middleburg, Virginia, where she was President of the Student Body and Valedictorian of the Senior Class. She received her B.A. from Vassar College and was a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

Mrs. Armstrong is a member of the Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services; the County Board of Education, Kenedy County, Texas; and the Board of Governors, Stratford Hall (Robert E. Lee home).

She is the founder of Tops 'N Texas, an annual statewide awards program recognizing three women for outstanding community service.

Mrs. Armstrong has been active in the Republican Party in the State of Texas and has served as State Vice-Chairman and as National Committeewoman. In January, 1971, she became the first woman to be elected to the elevated position of Co-Chairman of the Republican National Committee. In August of 1972 in Miami Beach, she became the first woman to deliver a keynote address at a major national political convention and was also elected Secretary of the Convention.

In January of 1973, Mrs. Armstrong was appointed by President Nixon as Counsellor to the President with Cabinet rank. She is the first woman to hold that title.

Mrs. Armstrong's areas of responsibility include youth, women, the Spanish-speaking, the Bicentennial, and the New Federalism. She is a member of the Domestic Council, the Cost of Living Council, the Commission on the Organization of Government for the Conduct of Foreign Policy, and serves as Chairman of the Federal Property Council which includes the Legacy of Parks program.

[For immediate release, Dec. 18, 1972]

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY—THE WHITE HOUSE

The President today announced that he would appoint Mrs. Anne Armstrong a Counsellor to the President, with Cabinet rank.

Mrs. Armstrong has been Co-Chairman of the Republican National Committee since January 1971 and was the first woman elected to that position. She also serves as a member of the RNC's Executive Committee and has been a Republican National Committeewoman from Texas since 1968. She served as Secretary of the 1972 Republican National Convention and was the first woman keynoter of a major party convention. Mrs. Armstrong was a member of the Platform Committee for the 1964 and 1968 Republican conventions. Long active in Texas politics, she has held a number of positions including Vice Chairman of the Texas Republican Party from 1966 to 1968.

She has been a member of the Kenedy County (Texas) School Board since her election in 1968 and she was re-elected in 1971. Mrs. Armstrong was a founder of the Tops 'n Texas annual statewide awards program recognizing three women for outstanding community service. She is a Director of the Coastal Bend Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association, and serves as a member of the Advisory Committee of the Eagleton Center for American Women and Politics of Rutgers University, the Defense Advisory Committee for Women in the Service, and the Board of Directors of Stratford Hall, the Robert E. Lee Home.

Mrs. Armstrong was born Anne Legendre on December 27, 1927, in New Orleans, Louisiana. She was graduated from the Foxcroft School in Middleburg, Virginia, where she was student body president and senior class valedictorian, and in 1949 from Vassar College, where she was elected to Phi Beta Kappa.

She is married to Tobin Armstrong. They have five children and reside in Armstrong, Texas.

Mr. DRINAN. All right. Thank you.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

May I just say, in closing, that we do not mean to harass you, sir. We are just trying to find out facts and trying to find out how we can implement our oversight function of this agency, and, in all fairness, it is very difficult to find out the facts about the agency. I would welcome any further information that you would care to send to the Committee.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Mr. Congressman, I want to thank you for your questions, and I want to help and cooperate in this very important meeting. I have seen the civil rights laws that up to now have not worked for the Spanish-speaking people but have worked for the well-known group. We want to know how we can make them now work for us. As I said before, I would invite the opportunity, the chance to indicate or make suggestions as to how this committee in its very important work can also look into other places where we are being excluded.

There is, for example, some money that went for developing institutions. This program in the Office of Education allocated, I believe, something like $17 million to assist minority students and minority institutions. The Spanish-speaking people received little of this money.

Most of that money went into colleges of another well-known group. I become very concerned when we do not receive our due share of that.

At NIH, there is a program for minority schools to buy medical support. There, we receive so very little. And this happens over and over. All over this town, we become excluded, overlooked, and that concerns me deeply. It concerns the Spanish-speaking people in this country deeply.

Mr. DRINAN. In conclusion, I just like to request that the committee does ask the Committee to Reelect to send us every communication that they sent to the Cabinet Committee.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is there any objection?

Mr. WIGGINS. No.

Mr. EDWARDS. Without objection, so ordered.

[The information referred to has been retained in committee files.]

Mr. Rangel?

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Dr. Ramirez and your staff, for coming here today.

You have indicated—and I support the concept that you would like to bring government a little closer to the Spanish-speaking people.

Has your office attempted to include the Congress as part of that Government?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Congressman, I believe we have a lot of improvement to make in that area. We tried to keep the Congressmen and Senators informed about the activities that we were conducting or the assistance that we were providing or the assistance that we were getting from other agencies to provide for Spanish-speaking people throughout the country.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, to be more specific, then——

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, to be more specific: For example, let us say that we do something in the New York area and we are able to acquire some

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

assistance for groups there. I think that we should, at the same time, send a carbon copy or make a phone call to the Congressman in that area to let him know what we have done there.

Mr. RANGEL. That is projected. And what I really want to find out, as it relates to the city of New York, is: Have you included any Members of Congress that represent Spanish-speaking people in any conference that you have had since your Cabinet Committee has been formed?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I believe it was 3 months or 4 months after I came that we assisted in the development of an economic development corporation in New York. I forget the name of it. I know that Senator Javits' and Senator Buckley's staffs were involved in that meeting. I believe there have been other examples where we have brought congressional offices together with the people. We do that very frequently because of the close relationship. For example we have Congressman White from El Paso who wants to have a conference on the issues affecting the Spanish-speaking people. Some of our staff is working very closely with him on planning those meetings.

Mr. RANGEL. But as it relates to Members of the House that represent various areas in the city of New York, have any Members been called into any conference to share some of the problems that they may have or to receive what assistance your office could render to them or the staff office in the communities they represent?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I do not recall any, but that is certainly an area in which we are weak and should improve.

Mr. RANGEL. Who would be the director of region 2 office?

Dr. RAMIREZ. We do not have a regional director. We have a small staff here in Washington. We do not have people in the regions at all.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, what did you mean when you said that you attempted to bring government to the people?

How would somebody recognize that these services were available to your office unless they came to Washington?

Dr. RAMIREZ. For example: once we have gone to New York. As a result the regional directors they make themselves more available to the Puerto Rican community.

Mr. RANGEL. I thought that you said you did not have a regional director there.

Dr. RAMIREZ. I was not referring to regional directors but to the personnel who belong to the committee, that is the personnel who belong to HEW, HUD, Department of Labor, the Treasury. In working with members of the committee we have developed plans and designs whereby their regional directors in New York are able to reach out more effectively to Puerto Ricans.

Mr. RANGEL. I have represented poor people all my life. Can you tell me how a poor person who wants to know what Government services are available—assuming that they do not stop in at a Congressman's office—what would they have to do in order to contact a member of your committee that has those services available?

Dr. RAMIREZ. We have a newsletter in which we communicate with the people.

Mr. RANGEL. Are the Members of Congress on the mailing list?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, sir, they are.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. RANGEL. How often does that newsletter go out?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Monthly. But I am changing it to once every 2 weeks, next month.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, assuming that New York City represents an area where large numbers of Spanish-speaking people are, how do you formally or informally contact a person that has a full understanding or some understanding of the needs of those people?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, I work very closely with the director of OEO in New York.

Mr. RANGEL. I am sharing with you the concerns of the people. They believe, if you are part of the Government you are part of the Establishment.

Are there some people in New York that have made names for themselves in community work that you can call from time to time and say: "What are we doing there? How can we help?"

Dr. RAMIREZ. I am in very close contact with a very close friend of mine who has a radio program.

Mr. RANGEL. Most of us that live very close to the situation are a little sensitive as to who is reaching out. But what I really want to——

Dr. RAMIREZ. Senator Garcia.

Mr. RANGEL. You do work Senator Garcia?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Certainly.

Mr. RANGEL. So that if he were to have an office open in the community, he would have access to your Washington office in order to assist the people in getting the service from the White House to the people in his district?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes; we, in fact, have been on the phone quite often. I would say the people in New York would know a great deal about the Cabinet Committee.

The New York newspapers write about me quite frequently. Sometimes this press hurts me and seems insensitive to our recognition of their needs. I have made many trips to New York and touched bases with the Civil Rights Association.

In fact, 1½ years ago, I was a recipient of an honorary award and the guest of honor at a banquet attended by 1,000 people. In fact, just in 1½ weeks, I am going to a baseball game at Yankee Stadium. The Puerto Rican and Cuban baseball clubs will be there. Sometimes they ask me to throw the first baseball.

Mr. RANGEL. It may be a big event, but I assure you the Spanish-speaking people are not asking me to throw baseballs. And I would like to say that they have been very helpful to me in problems that I have had in trying to bring Government a little closer to the people.

It seems to me, in the terms that I have read—whether it comes from CREEP or whomever it comes from—I think most people, poor people generally, do not know what services are available. They need all of the assistance that they can get, and most of us in public life—whether it is on the city level or whether it is on the State level or in the form of State legislation—and, certainly, as Congressmen, we do have, of course, our offices that are available in these communities. It just seems to me that it would serve your Cabinet Committee, but more importantly the Spanish-speaking people, since you do not have the budget or since you do not have the office located in these communities, if they were served in a bipartisan way, because it is not our fault that

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

these communities are Democrats, the majority, to whom we could share what services were available for rendering regardless of what office we had.

I would be very anxious to meet with that committee that you have set up in region 2, even though I am sure that 26 Federal Plaza, for most people in my community, is just as far away as Washington, D.C., and many times more inaccessible to people that have problems there.

I was hoping that you might be able to provide to me those names of people in the Government, since we, in the House, have found it very difficult to bring Government together, much less people in Government, with all the problems we have, as related to services for poor people generally.

It just seems to me that there should be somebody in your staff office that would be working with Members of Congress representing the poor people, to get the benefit of your research and for us to be able to tell you what is happening out there on the Second, Third and Lexington avenues of the world.

[The following information was submitted subsequent to the termination of the hearing:]

GOVERNMENT CONTACTS—NEW YORK REGION II

Angel Rivera, Regional Director OEO, Vice-Chairman of Regional Council.
Victor Rivera, Regional Director Small Business Administration.
Ed Mercado, District Director Office Equal Opportunity.
Andy White, Deputy Director Office Equal Opportunity.
Dr. Jaime Rivera Duenos, Director HEW.
Robert Perez, HEW.
Edward Aponte, Regional Manpower Administration, DOL.
Jack Sims, Emergency School Aid, OEO.
Pereta Balien, NIMH.
David Grossman, Associate Regional Director, Community Affairs, HEW.
Frederick Sillman, Associate Regional Director, Health and Scientific Affairs.
Frank DiGiovanni, Health Services Administration.
Bill Green, Regional Director HUD; also Chairman of Regional Council.
Josua Diaz, Assoc. Regional Director Office Child Development.
Raul Ratcliff, Department of Justice.
Christina Munoz, HEW.

Mr. RANGEL. If I were to ask you, as a Member of Congress, how we could get more money for bilingual education, how we could get more people involved in OEO programs, we certainly would like to hear from your office about Spanish-speaking people as a result of your research, the beneficiaries. We know what they have not received. Would it be outside of your responsibility to let your view be known? Have you a free-agency liaison to be able to say, to this extent: "We think this type of legislation would help, in addition to other things the administration is trying to do."

Listen, we know the restrictions that are placed on appointments. I do not want to put you in an embarrassing position, but do you have any staff legislative assistant, somebody that could study proposed legislation, to see whether or not Spanish-speaking people are included, and, if they are, whether they are beneficiaries of the legislation that may be passed?

Dr. RAMIREZ. We were able recently to hire a person who will assist us in that area. Up to now, we just have not had that kind of staff to do these things.

ERIC
0025

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. RANGEL. You know, one of the worst things that you can do for poor people, whether they are Spanish-speaking or not, is to give false hopes, and the creation of your office probably allowed many Spanish-speaking people to think that now for the first time they would have "our man" in the White House and we should be able to touch bases with him. I know that it is difficult for you to cover 50 States, but what is it that you can do or are doing besides regular agency appointees? Who would be on the mailing list? Would it be the registered voters? Would it be just the other people in the Federal agencies? How can people in a given community help you to bring your services to them or, indeed, support whatever you are doing?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I guess we are talking in general terms, Congressman. As I hear you present these items, I will try to follow each point. For a while I thought you were asking whether or not we should have a representative in the regional offices.

Certainly, we should have a person there.

I also thought I picked up——

Mr. RANGEL. In the Veterans' Administration, we have Spanish-speaking people coming back from the war—and confused. We do not know what kind of flack they are getting down there. Does the President's office or your office have somebody in the Veterans' Administration so that you can have reported back whether Spanish-speaking people are being given proper guidelines?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Let me go through the thrusts of all of your comments with some degree of specificity. You asked about a liaison with whom we can touch bases when we need some charges or some assistance.

Mr. RANGEL. No, I did not mean that. I do not mean when you need assistance. If they can reach you, obviously, the Veterans' Administration does not need any more assistance.

I am talking about: How would you know what assistance is generally given to the group which you have taken in to serve?

What do you have out in the community to really know whether you were doing the job or what you need to do a better job?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Let us compare it to the Civil Rights law of 1964. Again, we have the FCC setup, the EEOC setup——

Mr. RANGEL. I certainly would not depend on that group to find out what is going on.

Dr. RAMIREZ. They were set up primarily with black Americans.

Mr. RANGEL. I can tell you that I am experienced with them. So, it is obvious that both groups need more than that.

Dr. RAMIREZ. The fact of the matter is that Spanish-speaking people are not even in there yet. These people are being paid to provide these opportunities.

Mr. RANGEL. That is not bringing Government closer to the people, getting somebody on the payroll, whether it is an employer or an employee. That is not bringing Government closer to the people. It is bringing some guy in that has a job in an office, but the people really cannot contact that person. It seems to me that in your suggested legislation, perhaps, if you could have a meeting with those Members of Congress that represent the communities—and I assume that you have some kind of men for nonpolitical purposes—and the Spanish-speaking people in groups.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. RAMIREZ. The Census Bureau has developed——

Mr. RANGEL. No, I do not mean the Bureau. I mean your bureau.

Dr. RAMIREZ. The bureau belongs to the Committee; they belong to our Committee.

Now, I would like to point out, Congressman, that, yes, the Cabinet Committee is known by maybe 10 percent of the Spanish-speaking people, maybe 20 percent. To many, it becomes a beacon of too many hopes. I concur with your sentiments, but I would like to point out that in relation to, say, the Chicano and Mexican American——

Mr. RANGEL. I have enough problems in New York without going to California.

Dr. RAMIREZ. I am trying to put this in perspective, if I may.

Since 1850, there was a change. People of my background went to war. After that war—many things were done. Certain laws were passed. English was forbidden in many places——

Mr. RANGEL. You are going to give me equal time, I assume.

Dr. RAMIREZ. We became a people. We were not a part of the Federal system in Washington, D.C., until these laws of a few years ago. Finally the Spanish-speaking people were included. They just recently began to participate and that is over a century since that war.

I am very proud to be a part of this history. I am very proud of what is happening now. I am very proud that we are being included, that we are heading some agencies in this country.

Mr. RANGEL. What agencies?

I just do not know. I do not mean to be facetious, but I mean when I look at the White House staff, I just do not find any ethnics at all—blacks, Spanish-speaking, I mean, I just do not know. If you could help me out.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Congressman, I am very proud that the Spanish-speaking people are now being included in such things as the 16-point program, since we were not included in the civil rights laws that were passed before. This is happening now, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. RANGEL. How do you enforce those laws unless you have some troops that make people aware that the laws now include them—if that is what you are saying? Because I believe that the Constitution itself would include people that you are sworn to serve. It really does not make any difference how many laws you have if the law itself is not enforced, unless you have people there to educate people as to what their rights are.

All we are doing is whistling the "Star Spangled Banner" and moving on saying that they are included. I do not know of any Spanish-speaking people, with the exception of yourself and your committee, that I could call upon to assist me in some of the housing problems that I have in my community, the social service problems. I just do not know, and I suspect that your agency has the responsibility to serve me, too, because I have taken an oath to serve those people in the district. I cannot do it without the cooperation of this or any other administration, and all I am saying is that it just seems to me that if you can call together some type of meeting with people from various communities whom you have taken an oath to serve, then, perhaps, not only can we give suggestions but we can support the suggestions that you have already formulated, and here you would have in the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

House of Representatives a group of people not concerned with their label of the President but rather what is available from the Government to the people.

Herman Badillo from the east coast is considered to be the first Puerto Rican Member of the House of Representatives in the history of the United States—and that does not go over as such a big deal on the east side. All I am trying to get from your Committee—and I hope you will submit the same thing that Congressman Wiggins suggested: What is it that you have in the form of legislation or in the form of congressional relationships between your Committee and the House and the Senate that can make you more effective or provide you the tools which you think are of necessity?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I would be very happy to, Congressman.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you for your patience, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Parker.

Mr. PARKER. Dr. Ramirez, as I read the congressional declaration of purpose of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking, it seems fairly clear that there were at least two thrusts: One is—and I am quoting:

> To assure that Federal programs are reaching all Mexican Americans, Puerto Rican Americans, Cuban Americans, and all of the Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed Americans and providing the assistance they need, and to seek out new programs that may be necessary to handle problems that are unique to such persons.

That congressional declaration of purpose was carried over into the section that deals with the functions of the Cabinet Committee and gave the Committee certain statutory functions.

I am quoting from section 4303 of the act:

> The Committee shall have the following functions: (1) to advise Federal departments and agencies regarding appropriate action to be taken to help assure that Federal programs to provide the assistance needed by Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed Americans, and to advise Federal departments and agencies on the development and implementation of comprehensive and coordinated policies, plans, and programs focussing on the special problems and needs of Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed Americans and on priorities thereunder.

You are also required to submit annual reports contained in section 4311 of that same statutory authority. It says that you have to make a report as soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year, submit a report to the President and the Congress of its activities for the preceding year, including in such report any recommendations the committee deems appropriate to accomplish the purposes of this chapter.

I have read your fiscal annual reports for 1971 and 1972. Are there any recommendations contained in there?

Dr. RAMIREZ. No, no specific recommendations, other than the recommendations that I have made in the hearings before Congress. I made specific recommendations before this committee last year.

Mr. PARKER. Have there been any other recommendations made directly to Congress?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes.

Mr. PARKER. Would you provide the committee with those?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I would be very happy to.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[The recommendations referred to follow:]

I have recommended the following before this Committee on March 9, 1972:

That the evaluation of every supervisor include the performance in implementing the President's 16-Point Program and Executive Order No. 11478.

That quarterly reports be submitted to heads of agencies reflecting specific employment patterns, together with recommendations for corrective action.

That the Office of Management and Budget evaluate agencies' racial and ethnic data collection systems, and where necessary, recommend changes to insure comprehensive civil rights implementation.

That Congress ask agencies about their employment patterns by ethnic and racial breakdowns at the time that the agencies are asking for funding.

That the heads of agencies make available to Spanish-speaking organizations and leaders the accomplishments of their application of the 16-Point Program and other related employment directives.

That Congress enact the Bill H.R. 1746, titled "Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972."

I have also recommended to Congress the passage of House Joint Resolution 89 which would have the Department of Labor and the Bureau of the Census collect and publish data regarding unemployment rate among Spanish-speaking Americans. This resolution would also have the Department of Labor, the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Agriculture undertake further efforts to collect and publish statistics which provide indicators of the social and economic condition of Spanish speaking citizens in urban and rural America.

Mr. PARKER. Now, the code is also very explicit about the meetings, and in part (e) of section 4302, it describes the Cabinet Committee. It says that the Committee shall meet at least quarterly each year.

In response to the question earlier, you said that you thought the Committee should meet more often.

Can you tell whose responsibility it is to call the Cabinet Committee to meet four times a year?

Let me phrase it another way. As Chairman, do you consider it your responsibility?

Dr. RAMIREZ. It is the Chairman's responsibility. I have called for meetings more frequently. Sometimes, you cannot get these persons there.

Mr. PARKER. Well, do I understand that the meetings were called and not attended by the other members of the Committee that were statutorily set forth or that meetings were not called in anticipation that they would not attend?

Dr. RAMIREZ. The way this works is that I will indicate that it is time for another meeting of the members of the Cabinet Committee. They look at their calendar of the meetings to determine when it will be possible to have a meeting. Sometimes, it is just not possible to schedule a meeting. I discharge my responsibility in that manner.

Mr. PARKER. Well, did you interpret then this section 4302 to leave it to the discretion of the Chairman to call meetings, or that there actually had to be quarterly meetings at least each year?

Dr. RAMIREZ. The Chairman requests these meetings——

Mr. PARKER. But you are saying that you do not request them.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Oh, no, I did not say that.

Mr. PARKER. Then, I am confused.

The meetings were called and requested and not attended, or the meetings were simply never called?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I indicated that it is necessary to check the calendar of the Cabinet officers in the White House, because they are very busy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

men. I have been insistent that these meetings be held four times a year in order to comply with the statute. It is not been possible.

Mr. Parker. In other words, your office would contact their offices by telephone and see if they were busy or free?

Dr. Ramirez. We would contact the White House and indicate that we would like to have a meeting.

Mr. Parker. What response did you get?

Dr. Ramirez. They would look into their calendar and see when it would be possible.

Mr. Parker. Who in the White House would your office contact?

Dr. Ramirez. In the beginning, I would consult with Mr. Robert Finch, our liaison person. Now I consult with Mrs. Anne Armstrong.

Mr. Parker. Did you ever impress upon the liaison person that it was required by law to hold meetings four times a year?

Dr. Ramirez. Mr. Counsel, you cannot imagine how much I stressed this point.

Mr. Parker. These efforts were simply met with no success?

Dr. Ramirez. I would not say "no success," but we did not have meetings. I would call it a measured success.

Mr. Edwards. Would counsel yield?

Mr. Parker. Yes.

Mr. Edwards. Who showed up at those meetings, Dr. Ramirez? Isn't a member of the committee the Secretary of Agriculture? Did he show up at any of the meetings?

Dr. Ramirez. Yes.

Mr. Edwards. The Secretary of Commerce?

Dr. Ramirez. Yes.

Mr. Edwards. The Attorney General?

Dr. Ramirez. Yes. That was the first time I met Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Parker. I take it that the form showing the attendance was kept at these Cabinet Committee meetings?

Dr. Ramirez. By the White House.

Mr. Wiggins. Would counsel yield?

Mr. Parker. Yes.

Mr. Wiggins. The statute says that the Committee, to whom these questions are addressed, shall be composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney General, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, the Commissioner of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission most concerned with the Spanish speaking and Spanish surnamed Americans, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, and the Chairman of the Committee.

That is a high power Committee.

Dr. Ramirez, would it be a desirable change in the legislation to have the Committee composed of representatives of these individuals of certain rank rather than to mandate that the Committee be composed at the Secretary level who literally are having Cabinet meetings here?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I can appreciate the special problems of getting the agreed time for these people to meet on any subject unless the President himself calls.

Do you have any observations with respect to recommended changes designating representatives of the Cabinet officials of a particular rank who would be indicated as the policy men in absence of the Secretaries? Would that be a constructive change?

Dr. RAMIREZ. That is an option that should be considered.

I am not prepared at this moment to recommend that change. That action among others should be considered.

Mr. WIGGINS. I yield back.

Mr. RANGEL. Would counsel just yield on a question?

Mr. PARKER. Yes.

Mr. RANGEL. In order to assist you with this option, is it possible for you to furnish this committee with the requests for meetings that you have had with the White House and the meetings that you did have with the committee, and who was in attendance at these meetings? Because I agree with Congressman Wiggins. It seems like it would be almost impossible to get all of these people together. Could we have some idea of what compliance of the law did exist in the last few years? Is that in the record?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I am not sure. I was going to look into it.

Mr. RANGEL. Does anyone—would you know how many meetings were actually held and who were in attendance at these meetings?

Dr. RAMIREZ. We have had three meetings since I was confirmed in 1971. Prior to that, I think there were two meetings. We also have a meeting coming up next week.

Mr. RANGEL. Did you interpret this to be your responsibility and you were not getting cooperation and would need some assistance to prevent you from being held in violation of the Federal law?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I have made many efforts to discharge that part of the law.

So, I am not concerned there.

Mr. RANGEL. You are not concerned with what?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I have made many efforts to comply with the Federal law.

Mr. RANGEL. If you interpret that you held the responsibility to have these four meetings a year and notwithstanding your good efforts, you have been unable to hold them, and if it is true you could be held in violation of the law, it seems to me that you would want some assistance, some legislative assistance, to make sure that you were not held criminally nor civilly liable, especially in this administration you would want all the help you could get. So, I am suggesting that if you have tried to work within the four corners of the law and you cannot get the people together at a meeting that perhaps there should be some change in the law to at least relieve you of this responsibility.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Thank you, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. RANGEL. I yield back.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Subsequent to the termination of the hearing the following information was submitted:]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MINUTES OF THE CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH SPEAKING PEOPLE, AUGUST 5, 1971

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford M. Hardin.
Secretary of Commerce, Maurice H. Stans.
Secretary of Labor, James D. Hodgeson.
Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Elliot Richardson.
Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney.
Secretary of the Treasury, Charles Walker.
Attorney General, John Mitchell.
Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Phillip V. Sanchez.
Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Thomas Kleppe.
Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, William S. Brown.
Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Robert Hampton.
Counsellor to the President, Robert H. Finch, Vice Chairman of the Committee.
John Oldecker.

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT

Antonio Rodriguez, Executive Director, Staff of the Cabinet Committee.
George Grassmuck, Office of Counsellor Finch.
Patricia Reilly Hitt, Assistant Secretary of Regional Coordination, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Stan Scott.
John Venneman.
Fred Malek.
Fernando E.C. de Baca.
The Advisory Council to the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People.

Counsellor Finch called the meeting to order. He commented briefly on the activities and achievements of Federal departments and agencies toward upgrading Spanish speaking Americans in all areas of government activity. He described the June 4 meeting in San Francisco involving the Regional Directors of five departments, representatives of the Cabinet Committee staff as well as members of the Spanish speaking community. This meeting served as the prototype for the forthcoming Regional Council conferences.

President Nixon then addressed his remarks to the Cabinet Committee members. He stressed that there has not been enough action and follow-through on the part of Federal departments and agencies on behalf of Spanish speaking Americans. Unlike other more vocal minority groups, Hispanic Americans do not have an effective lobby, and there has not been enough pressure from the media, from Congress, and from within Spanish communities themselves to bring about effective action. In the face of recent violence and disruption by other minorities, the President lauded Spanish Americans for their consistent loyalty and respect for the law, and stressed that Cabinet Committee members must take the initiative to bring about greater Federal responsiveness to the Spanish speaking population.

The President emphasized that Federal agencies must seek position openings and fill vacant slots with Spanish speaking Americans. He reiterated that it is the responsibility of the Federal government to actively recruit persons for position openings, for there is a great need for new talent.

The President terminated his statement by requesting quarterly reports from each Cabinet Committee member delineating the progress of his agencies toward providing increased opportunities for Spanish speaking Americans.

Chairman Ramirez introduced the nine members of the newly-appointed Advisory Council to the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish speaking People. He then briefly summarized his directions, goals and objectives as Chairman of the Committee, emphasizing the need for quantitative goals for Federal employment and delivery of services, and the continuing quarterly assessment of progress toward meeting these goals.

The meeting was adjourned.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

MEETING OF THE CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE, APRIL 20, 1972

(Chaired by Henry M. Ramirez, Chairman, CCOSSP)

ATTENDEES

Committee Members

Robert Finch, Counsellor to the President.
Robert Hampton, Chairman, Civil Service Commission.
James D. Hodgson, Secretary, Department of Labor.
Raymond Telles, Commissioner, Equal Employment Opportunities Commission.

Representatives

James Allen, Under Secretary, Department of Commerce.
Frank Elliott, Assistant Secretary, Department of Agriculture.
Ralph Erickson, Assistant Attorney General, Justice Department.
Samuel Evans, Treasury Department.
Wes Hjornevik, Deputy Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.
Barry Locke, Special Assistant to the Secretary, Department of Transportation.
Malcolm Peabody, Department of Housing and Urban Development.
David Wellman, Office of Management and Budget.

Invited Guests

Manuel Carrillo, Director, Office for Spanish-Surnamed American Affairs, Department of Health, Education & Welfare.
Carlos Conde, The White House.
Cathy Doolin, Deputy Director for Special Concerns, HEW.
David Dukes, Department of Health, Education & Welfare.
Rayburn Hanzlik, The White House.
Irving Kator, Civil Service Commission.
Thomas Kleppe, Administrator, Small Business Administration.
William Marumoto, The White House.
William Parker, Veterans' Administration.
William Seabron, Department of Agriculture.

Cabinet Committee Advisory Council Members

Manuel Gilberga.
Manuel Gonzales.
Ignacio Lozano.
Eugene Marin.
Ted Martinez.

CCOSSP Staff Representatives

Ben Cortez, Consultant.
Mercedes Flores, Administrative Assistant to the Chairman and Recording Secretary.
Donald Happe, Consultant to the Chairman.
Diana Lozano, Special Assistant to the Chairman.

Chairman Ramirez called the meeting to order and introduced the CCOSSP Advisory Council members present—Manuel Gilberga, Ted Martinez, Eugene Marin, Ignacio Lozano and Manuel Gonzales. He felt that much had been gained over the past year to dispell the notion perceived by the community and some people in Washington that the Cabinet Committee is an Agency in itself. He emphasized that it is a committee composed of the member agencies there present and that is was *their* committee.

The Chairman then presented a CCOSSP priority list which he called the "blue print" to bring the Spanish speaking into the mainstream of American society. He said that the Advisory Council had made a few minor changes at their meeting on the preceding day, but the overall plan had been fully accepted by them. He then submitted it for the Cabinet Committee's review and comment. He indicated that he believed that if this document were adopted and implemented it would turn the present situation around so that by 1980 the Spanish speaking would come into the mainstream and fabric of American life. He continued by

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

saying that if it were not implemented, the committee would continue to hobble and dilute its way in behalf of the Spanish-speaking people in such a fashion that it would take 10 years to accomplish the same thing. He then reiterated that this was their committee. Mr. Ramirez discussed briefly the Regional Council meetings and then introduced Counselor Robert Finch.

Counselor Finch said that the exciting thing about the Regional Council meetings was that they were experimental. For the first time, the Regional Directors had to sit down and establish where they were now and then work out a long and short term program. At these Regional Council meetings we had a chance to mold future directions and there are a great many fringe benefits coming out of them. He said that the working groups have been asked to see what dollars could be eyeled out of the regional offices before the end of this fiscal year. He emphasized that it is highly important that each agency respond readily since the fiscal year is almost over. He stressed that this money could meet a great many needs and we could get a great deal out of it. But how we handle it is important. He then introduced Mr. David Weinman of OMB.

Mr. Weinman said that the following amounts have been set aside by the various agencies to allow their regional offices to participate in programs for the Spanish-speaking at the regional level in the areas of Federal employment, contract compliance and programming: HEW, $4.75 million; Labor, $1.99 million; HUD, $2.2 million; OEO, $1.0 million; EPA, $0.5 million; TEXX, $0.48 million. He stated that the Councils were asked to submit a detailed action plan in draft form and then a final action plan. This was done in order to get a quality report on how that action plan is to be used—and a year from now we should know what has really happened.

Mr. Finch suggested that Regional press coverage be used—developing a page one approach geared to the particular region, and that the committee should get together to work this out.

Mr. Hodgson of Labor asked if Mr. Finch felt in his meetings with the regional people that they had the feeling that the department heads had gotten the "word". Mr. Finch replied that in some cases yes, but in others the linkage was absent.

Mr. Tobin interjected that if you give this the wrong kind of publicity, you may find that 75% of the money has been used. Mr. Finch then stated that he spends 1/3 of his time trying to get this kind of publicity in the Congressional Record, and that it is interesting to see how distorted it can get in Washington. Mr. Tobin said that what we are looking for is how to get the most out of it. At the present time, each region puts major emphasis in their particular programs for their particular region.

Mr. Locke, of DoT, then gave an example where in his agency they have given a number of contracts that will make a great impact in a particular area; however, he felt that what is needed is a strong action plan at a region-wide level. He suggested that maybe it should be announced at the Cabinet Committee level stressing the President's interest in this program and that would give it impact down at the local and regional levels. There was then a brief discussion regarding what is and should be considered new money and what is recycled money. It was mentioned that when an agency started to fund projects that were at the bottom of the pile it can be considered new money.

Mr. Finch interjected that the grants should be programmed in such a way as to get the most out of it.

Irving Kator, of the Civil Service Commission, said that the 16-Point Program was started in November 1970 in recognition of and to give urgency to the problems of the Spanish-speaking community. Statistics show a small gain, 2% of total Federal employment. This showed that we could and had to do better. Also, in communities in certain areas of the country, issuing this as an agency action program, people could move up and produce a little more. He mentioned that from May 1970 to 71 Spanish speaking employment in the Federal Government increased by 1,500 jobs. This came during a period of major decline in the overall Federal employment. More importantly, we must note that this came in less than six months immediately after the start of the 16-Point Program. This, however, was not enough to change the percentage point and, results, we are nowhere near the point we should be and a lot more action is needed. The major need we have to develop, said Mr. Kator, is to develop a sensitivity in the need for hiring the Spanish speaking. Even now there is a tremendous lack of knowledge in the field on this matter.

Secretary Hodgson asked what kind of progress we are making.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. Kates replied that they had made an on-site inspection visit to installations and asked for reports from headquarters as well as the Regional Offices, and they found that frequently they have just not heard the word. The message is that the active support of the Agency heads is important. We would like to ask the Agencies to include the 16-Point Program in their overall action program. He mentioned that the military is one of the large problem areas.

Mr. Klepper, Administrator of SBA, said he was wondering what level was being discussed, and that he would like to know more about it, as it did not ring a bell with SBA.

Mr. Finch stated that the SBA portfolios had done a great job with the Spanish speaking, and that many of them were good ventures. What happened is that at the regional levels they started competing.

It was asked how there could be this large dropout in Federal Government employment, an increase in Spanish speaking employment, and yet the percentage did not change. The reply was that when you start at such a low pace, it is difficult to change the percentage.

Mr. Feliz, of EEOC, said that as he travels around the country, he finds that most people are happy with the 16-Point Program, in the sense that they have faith and hope in the program; but, in 99% of the cases, they do not feel that the individuals responsible to follow up on this program are at the level to put pressure on the people who can really do something.

Mr. Finch said that it has been recommended that there should be a three-man task force in each Federal Department and Agency to have the responsibility for increasing the participation of the Spanish speaking in every level of Government employment and to receive the benefits of all kinds of Government programs.

Mr. Ramirez recommended that the persons assigned to this task force be of a very high level in order to give it sufficient strength. Their function would be to assure the effective implementation of the 16-Point Program in each agency on a nation-wide basis; insure that programs, contracts and procurement of each agency benefit the Spanish speaking communities equitably; and to develop adequate data collection and analysis in each agency to insure the effective measurement of progress. He then stressed that these should be full time committees composed of people who are influential in their Agencies so as to have the full support of the Secretaries.

Mr. Hodgson stated that they just had a task force to deal with equal employment opportunities in his department, and now we create this. He feels that it will be different for different agencies.

Mr. Finch stated that what we are really interested in is results—and that there must be flexibility. He said that it would be incumbent on each agency to set it up within their own structure and that the commitment and initiation of positive action must be generated from the agencies themselves.

One of the attendees suggested that it would be better if the Secretary were to go to the Under Secretary and then to the Assistant Secretary and set a goal of three weeks for the first report and a due date of four weeks for the final report. The responsible person then knows that the due date has been set, and that he is going to have a problem if he does not show definite progress. He felt that a committee would have much less effect than if the Secretary wanted it done.

Mr. Ramirez stated that the policy is not the concern; the problem is the implementation. He mentioned that at the Regional Council meeting in California, the main topic of discusson was implementaton. Once they saw how it was going to be implemented, they felt better.

Mr. Finch said that he would like to mention a matter that dealt with everyone in the room. He stated that there would be an NLRB decision shortly and that he hoped that no one here, or anyone speaking for the Cabinet Committee, takes any position on this matter until it is resolved. Although the issue has partisan overtones, they are trying to work out something that will be satisfactory to all parties concerned and the concept being considered is commendable.

The Chairman said that since the time was getting short, he would now recognize anyone who had any comment to make. He then recognized Dr. Manuel Gilberga.

Dr. Gilberga stated that as Vice Chairman of the CCOSSP Advisory Council, he would like to congratulate Mr. Ramirez for doing a splendid job in trying to give the Spanish speaking of this country a fair chance. In his opinion the 16-Point Program has achieved great success—even though there is a long road to go.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is getting off the ground and is a great success for the President despite the claims of Congress. He said that he is very proud of the way the Nixon Administration has cared for the Spanish-speaking people and gave his full support to the Cabinet Committee. He stated that he did feel, however, that the Cubans should have their fair proportion of these programs in the future.

The next to be recognized was Mr. Manuel Gonzales who commended Mr. Ramirez and the Cabinet Committee for handling a difficult area where there are different factions like Puerto Ricans, Dominicans, Cubans, Mexican Americans, etc. He said that he felt that the task force should be set up according to the area (e.g., in New York it would be represented by Puerto Ricans and in Miami by Cubans. If they had the full support of the Secretaries, agencies, departments and regional offices would be more likely to work harder on this effort.

Mr. Ted Martinez then reaffirmed what had been said. He said that in the field some of these things are not really known and that it is necessary to see that it gets down to the local level. He said that he was particularly concerned about some of the recruiting efforts. He said that more often than not the agency sends a young, eager Chicano to talk to them about jobs but they have not jobs to offer. He suggested that if there were no jobs that this should be made very clear in the beginning, so as not to build up the expectations of the young people they are addressing. Very often the audience ends up by getting hurt and let down when, after filling out forms, etc., they find that there are really no jobs available and that these forms will just be filed in some talent bank.

Mr. Carlos Conde said that some inter-agency machinery should be set up, emanating from Herb Klein's office, and that OMB should make a point of this.

Mr. Finch said that Mr. Ramirez and Mr. Conde should call the Public Information Officers of the various agencies and see how this can be done.

Mr. Lozano suggested that some type of machinery be set up so that there is coordination at the national level.

Mr. Hodgson said that the Under Secretaries should be put in charge to assure that this gets done. These announcements are not really made by the Public Affairs people, but by the operations people. This kind of publicity will let the members of the Regional Council know what the other people are doing. He said that it could be done bilingually it would be better.

Mr. Conde said that he would like to count on the communications aspect of the meeting. He stated that he would start doing precisely what had been discussed and that they would increase public relations. He suggested a Regional meeting with the PIOs.

Mr. Finch said that if you institutionalize too much, you will get nothing. The Agencies and the Regional Councils have the responsibility to get the information out to the community the best way they know how.

Mr. Ramirez then adjourned the meeting.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH SPEAKING PEOPLE, JULY 18, 1973

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Henry M. Ramirez, who introduced Anne Armstrong, Counsellor to the President. She then made a short statement to those in attendance, who included:

MEMBER	(OR DESIGNEE)
Joseph Wright	Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture.
William Blunt	Acting Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, Department of Commerce.
Peter Brennan	Secretary, Department of Labor.
James Lynn	Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.
Joseph Sneed	Deputy Attorney General, Department of Justice.
Alvin Arnett	Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.
Thomas Kleppe	Administrator, Small Business Administration.
Jayne Spain	Vice Chairman, Civil Service Commission.
Frank Carlucci	Under Secretary, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
William Brown, III	Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.
Irving Kator	Assistant Executive Director, C.S.C.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GUESTS

Carmen Mayun, Director, Womens' Bureau, Dept. of Labor.
Higinio Costales, Director, Sixteen Point Program, C.S.C.
Manuel Carrillo, Director, Office for Spanish Surnamed Americans, H.E.W.

MEMBERS OF THE CHAIRMAN'S STAFF

Reynaldo Maduro, Fredric Slight, E.B. Duarte, and Secretary.

Anne Armstrong, Counsellor to the President, made the following remarks:

"Thank you, Mr. Ramirez, I am glad to be here representing the interest of the administration in the Spanish speaking people and am very happy about the good attendance. Not only should the Cabinet Committee be continued in public law, but equally important, as stated in the President's presentation for Spanish speaking Americans early in his first administration and reiterated when he asked me to take on these responsibilities, these interests must be developed. You have made an excellent beginning and are now at the point where your prime consideration is the institutionalizing, effecting, shaping the policy and program; in personnel with recruiting, hiring and training; in funding with contract procurement and compliance. We could search the country over without being able to convey what the Act intended for the Spanish speaking, but it ends on what YOU DO TO IT in government. As an example, the Cabinet Committee has earned a measure of success, but there are more Spanish speaking aims, so perhaps we do not have the necessary tools; we look forward to strengthening and augmenting that coverage of Spanish speaking aims."

Mr. Ramirez related the history of the CCOSSP as a frame of reference. He explained how the needs of the Spanish speaking were first recognized and legislation then enacted to satisfy those needs. He said,

"Because the Civil Rights laws of 1964 and 1965 were not reaching out effectively to the Spanish speaking people, the Interagency Committee was called together to discuss ways of making it more effective. At that time this Committee (your Committee), called the CCOSSP, was devised, adopted and legislated. This is why it exists - to bring the Spanish speaking people into the socio-economic mainstream. Within that frame of reference, let us take a look at where we are legislatively. We now are contemplating increasing the CCOSSP to include four agencies, the General Services Administration, the Veterans Administration, the Department of Transportation and the Department of Defense. (There are many opportunities here that should be available to the Spanish speaking also.) This recommendation will be presented to Congress next week. If you have some comments, certainly they would be welcome. In addition, we will be proposing to the Congress the adoption of a small number of regional offices in selected areas.

Since the enabling act for this Committee terminates on December 31, 1974, your Committee must come up with plans, ideas and strategies for the next five years. Plans that will assure the Spanish speaking participation in the opportunities in our government and in the private sector. What should be the shape of this new mechanism is up for consideration at this time.

In view of government mechanisms that already exist as provided by the legislation of 1964 and 1965, what should be the structure of this Committee? The Committee's staff is presently developing plans to be reviewed with Committee members and community leaders; we will be asking you for your suggestions, reaction and recommendations."

Comments from members and guests of the CCOSSP ensued:

THOMAS KEPPEL (SBA). Regarding these outlying offices. Please establish what you are to be providing: Outreach? What do you foresee them doing? How many offices?

Chairman RAMIREZ. At this time, six offices. As to where they would be located, that is still up for consideration; Los Angeles or San Francisco has already been discussed. These offices are to provide a continuing coordination with the Regional Councils and respective Federal Executive Boards.

Mr. KEPPEL. Areas of relatively high Spanish Speaking population?

Chairman RAMIREZ. Yes, like Denver, Dallas, Chicago, New York, Los Angeles. Their location is still being considered by O.M.B. at this time.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For the first time we plan to organize our activities through priorities and management by objectives. We feel this is the only way we can quantify what we do. Certainly we cannot be all things to all men. There will be certain areas we cannot service. Such areas as perhaps the elderly, law enforcement, and others should be postponed for next year. We must establish priorities.

The Sixteen Point Program, an equal opportunity program, was designed for the Spanish speaking people. We find this program is just now reaching down to the local level. Presently the program needs more refinement to define the responsibilities of those designated Sixteen Point Program Coordinators. Some guidelines should be developed to specify line and staff responsibilities and to place this coordinator at the highest place possible. I understand that H.E.W. has done so and has the coordinator reporting to the Under Secretary."

JAMES LYNN (H.U.D.). They report at H.U.D. through the personnel office on their activity situation.

JOSEPH WARNER (Agriculture). We are recruiting right now. The office of personnel is against what I want right now. If you want to get a program done, you have to put it in the position paper. We have three items. This will be a full-time position at the GS 13 level.

WILLIAM BLUNT (Commerce). We have appointed a Sixteen Point Program Coordinator who works with equal employment; he reports to the Assistant Secretary for Administration.

Mr. LYNN. I think this is a situation in which it is not how high the GS level but how heavy is his clout. People listen to those who work for us at the GS 14, 15, 16 level when they speak for the Secretary. But you put a high GS level without the authority to speak directly as a representative of the Secretary, and it might as well be a low GS position. There is no action if they think it is a paper exercise, no matter how high the GS level. If they know they are going to answer to the Secretary, everybody acts.

FRANK CARLUCCI (H.E.W.). A further point. Examine where they fit in the equal opportunity structure. Check to determine if he is structured for his line, with managers involved. You can recognize Spanish speaking problems become on a par with women's problems. We at H.E.W. are completely equal-opportunity-director oriented, holding the agency head accountable. Therefore, various offices are reporting directly in to that office.

Mr. WARNER. I totally agree. Each one has its own separate program; it depends upon the agency head. I also agree it is not important what grade level is assigned, but that the ongoing program receives pressure. It is set up as a separate office in our program.

Mr. LYNN. In statutory publications you get into a certain duplication problem. We made a calculation, got the program we needed, one that is at least equally set up, called "joint." This is the main thing. You could have an almost infinite variety of ways of approaching the problem. The key issue is whether the Secretary or agency head wants to get it done, whether he considers it important. If he doesn't, forget it. As always with important subjects, the job will be done. There must be a balance established for the late starters in equal opportunity, for the Spanish speaking and, even later, the women.

Secretary DENTON (H.U.D.). Persons assigned this responsibility not only should have the ability, but should have sensitivity to the Spanish speaking. Otherwise potential employers are not going to believe you are serious about it.

Mr. LYNN. There is a basic competition as to who is on top now, women, Indians, blacks, Spanish speaking. With thirty people in the competition you cannot satisfy anyone if you even lack one of these requirements. This is one of the primary problems. Other primary problems are: What are our priority options? Do they like here contractor hiring? What kind of employers? Having an awareness they cannot do everything at once. Give us some necessary authority, put ideas for this year. Coordinate with other groups so there is a clear-cut mandate in the field. Which minority groups we are to consider. Otherwise, some people will "cop out" on you. They will say they receive one memo on the Spanish speaking problems today, one concerning another minority group another day; name the particular aim for this quarter, year, or other time period.

Mr. KREPS. Are you suggesting that all these subjects should be considered as they apply to the Sixteen Point Program?

JOSEPH SNEED (Deputy Attorney General, D.J.). I think you are right, but it is an almost impossible task, to strike priorities.

Mr. LYNN. No. I am giving emphasis—on the continuation.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Chairman RAMIREZ. I met with Department of Defense people, Equal Employment Coordinators of the Western States, regarding problems of the Spanish speaking and received this feedback. 1. The Sixteen Point Program is not being followed up. 2. Adequate resources are not being assigned. As a result, many coordinators are barely part-time. 3. Many people are being assigned who do not possess the understanding, appreciation and skills because they do not have a deep concern for this particular minority problem. By way of comparison, a male chauvinist should not be assigned the responsibility for the Federal Womens' Program. The supervisor must ask himself who is the Sixteen Point Program immortal for? He should let the response be his guide to designating sensitive, or better, Spanish-speaking, personnel to this area. I urge you to look into this area.

Mr. KAYDEN. CSC's. It is clearly in the implementation; I think there have been some successes there too. Commit the Secretaries to talking about it; the framework is there, no question about it. We have the authorization to do the job. I am with it 100 percent. The important consideration is the kind of person in the job. Consider what we need to do, too. That is 100 percent right, but there is the danger of fragmentation. It is only since January that our office has what we need, a coordinator. It is a part of our equal opportunity program. We must maintain that organizationally; if we do not, we are not using our personnel tools. Upward mobility—all on one level—it should be one equal opportunity program organization. What Frank (Mr. Carlucci) said is right. The top man in H.E.W. is the Secretary. Then build into it the coordinator; then I think you have the organization to do the job.

Chairman RAMIREZ. Another significant item on the agenda I would like to have this Committee address itself to is establishing a policy that calls for collection and evaluation of ethnic beneficiary recipient data. Program managers cannot evaluate fairness and effectiveness of program delivery without ethnic data. We have data that reflects on the situation of the blacks. For that reason managers and supervisors have not been able to arrive at some very significant conclusions and specific action plans. That is not true for the Spanish speaking people. We cannot do that at this time. I know it is difficult with limited funds. I do not believe Spanish speaking people are going to come forward and volunteer to what extent they are or are not recipients. We must have better socio-economic indices for Spanish speaking Americans, accurately accounting for their degree of participation in government opportunities.

Mr. CARLUCCI. I agree there is a very urgent need; you should do it as part of a comprehensive program. We need to come to some definition of what minority groups are. Definition of what is a minor and what is an adult. This is an O.M.B. area, the gathering of data. Whatever extension is developed should be tied in with the whole picture. I would suggest that you establish liaison with O.M.B. on that.

Chairman RAMIREZ. I would like to have some feelings at this moment.

Mr. CARLUCCI. We certainly do need it; data is a bad problem in management. I have not been able to find any in two months.

Mr. BUNN, O.E.O. has Title VI development, but across the board. We have been working at D.O.L. from payroll lists to develop a computerized reporting system on a weekly/biweekly basis, though not planned specifically for the Spanish speaking. I will be happy to find those results and share them with the rest of the Committee.

Chairman RAMIREZ. Committee reports will include these ideas, thoughts, that Frank (Carlucci) has forwarded, the need for special design.

Mr. SAXON. Data gathering is analytical, the instrument of government. When you begin to try to identify groups, you receive benefits. You have to develop some kind of technique as to who are the ultimate beneficiaries; that is not easy. It is a very complex problem; we can get to looking into it.

Chairman RAMIREZ. There are certain areas where it is impossible. However certain areas do lend themselves to it very well.

Mr. SAXON. In biomedical research, who is the recipient? It is hard to tell.

Chairman RAMIREZ. Another key item on the agenda is a matter of importance: agency liaison. I find it difficult to communicate with Committee members because the only persons I can get in touch with are my "compadres" from other agencies. As a result, I can hardly function. The Chairman of your Committee has a very difficult time getting in touch with you and your key persons. In O.E.O. I can reach Mr. Arnett, but in other agencies it is almost impossible to reach the agency head. Someone should be assigned with instructions to be accessible to the Chairman in order that we can function.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mrs. ARMSTRONG. I would like to emphasize this for you must have good communications. If this group could get together, we could keep in far better touch—far better.

Chairman RAMIREZ. I want to keep in touch with the staff of this Committee, to meet with you to make it all work. This is the reason why we have not been able to move forward more rapidly. We will be following up with letters to you asking that you name your executive assistants to act as liaison with the Chairman and to meet with him on a monthly basis.

And now, let us discuss the migrant program, another priority on our agenda. Recently a meeting was convened to explore the need for a national policy on the hired agricultural workforce—migrant and seasonal farmworkers. The following participated: Messrs. Alvin Arnett, Frank Elliott, James Griffith, Donald L. Happe, John Kreidler, Steve McConahey, Robert McConnon, James Neville, Randal C. Teague, Bill Tiffins and your Chairman. The following recommendations were agreed upon:

"A national policy should be contingent upon the appointment of a national migrant and seasonal farmworker coordinating *authority*. After considering the obvious possibilities, it was recommended that such authority consist of one individual reporting to the Counselor to the President, the Domestic Council or other Executive office locus. This function would be supported by a small staff of, possibly, three specialists who would be highly expert in fields indicated by the provisions of the national policy. The thought was that such individual would be immediately responsive to the dictates and needs of the target group as well as those federal, state and private entities sharing programmatic and legal responsibilities for the group."

"It was especially recognized that such individual could also, by application of sound administrative and management principles:

"1. influence the most practical of resource applications to commonly accepted objectives;

"2. muster well considered legislative recommendations;

"3. identify and arrange for basic co-sponsored research;

"4. translate new field information and data into legislative, policy and operational formats;

"5. offset the economic, social and political powerlessness of the group by "speaking out in their behalf" in the top councils of the nation;

"6. act as principal correspondent with the executive offices and interstate councils of affected state governments, private institutions, Federal Regional Councils and the Assistant Secretaries Group, especially where revenue sharing practices, state covenants and other policies and agreements may have been negotiated and in effect;

"7. develop new proposed solutions to the basic problems for consideration of participating entities, and especially such proposed solutions that may result in the elimination or change of such practices or systems that are currently ineffective or inhumane in their effect, for example, the current migratory labor system. Develop and recommend coordinated changes in, or additions to the national policy.

"A national policy should define and clarify the specific responsibilities of the national coordinating authority recommended above. It should set forth the following elements of policy for the advice and compliance of affected entities:

"1. That federal departments and agencies which serve the target group will equitably engage in cosponsored research projects recommended by the national coordinating authority.

"2. That federal departments and agencies will support with resources, as may be required, an effective and centralized effort to acquire current data and information on the target group which will serve the interests of the federal establishment, as specified by the national coordinating authority, as well as the specific interests and needs of the cooperating departments.

"3. That federal departments and agencies will, by cooperating endeavor, direct an optimum level of program funds into designated channels that will result in a concerted effort to achieve objectives and guidelines established by the national coordinating authority.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"4. That federal departments and agencies will cooperate with the national coordinating authority in developing and demonstrating new solutions to the problems and needs associated with the target group.

"5. That federal budgetary planning give favorable consideration to and make provision for the accomplishment of mutual objectives identified and prioritized by the national coordinating authority. This especially in the matter of block grants and revenue sharing mechanisms which are aimed at the target group and under conditions where states have entered into mutual compacts to serve the migratory workforce and where participating states have uniform and effective intrastate organizational structures designed to deliver specified services to the target group at point of need.

"6. That federal departments and agencies cooperate with the national coordinating authority to develop new legislation, policy, programmatic and operational approaches that will facilitate the achievement of the objectives and plans anticipated by the national policy, according to an established priority of need.

"7. That by means of concerted federal attention to the needs of the target group, as may be required by the national policy, the national coordinating authority will alleviate or mitigate the economic, social and political powerlessness of the target group by "speaking out in their behalf" in the highest government councils, and by being responsive to their desires and needs within the prerogatives of delegated authority.

"Participating members of this deliberating group also recommended that a national policy be written as soon as possible and coordinated for final acceptance, adoption and promulgation."

Mr. ARNETT. Affirmative action is vitally necessary. As I get closer and closer to the problem I see that the litigation surrounding us at O.E.O. would not be necessary if only we had a national policy and plan. As you know, I am about to go to court today on it. As to the O.E.O. migrant programs, this table should know that it was all transferred to Secretary Brennan by way of delegation agreement. Today I met with Assistant Secretary Kolberg.

(There followed an interchange between Mr. Arnett and Secretary Brennan.)

Mr. ARNETT. The reason we are probably going to court is because we don't have a national program. Going now to the discussion of the migrants, O.E.O. found that the national migrant program should be moved to the Department of Labor. Semantically this makes a lot of sense. Meantime, however, there should be group caucuses, what-have-you. H.E.W. and O.E.O. are undertaking some stewardships growing out of the days when we had Councils. I mean that sixty days ago we should have had activity in this area, yet we really are not too terribly much further along than six months ago. O.M.B. called it back and has now delegated our undertaking to the Department of Labor. We do not have employees in place in one unit, at least, not the first quarter. At the end of September the Spanish speaking who by that time use this undertaking will use the Secretary Weinberger program. Surely, we can come to a resolution that makes sense.

Chairman RAMIREZ. There is a lack of national policy in this area.

Mr. WRIGHT. Bob McConnell went to D.O.L. There they were presented with a staff paper indicating what would be some strategies. They agreed there is an absolute need at this time for some overall coordination that simply does not exist. There is something H.U.D. is doing; it affects many Spanish speaking people and reaches out to other persons in our country; I will bring it up to see what feelings you have on it.

Mr. CARLUCCI. No question about it; the problem (I think the issue) is: How do you make it effective? Very few now work. From time to time we are creating new ones—automated. We must wait until we see what the study develops, two or three weeks more at most.

Mrs. ARMSTRONG. It is now 3:00 o'clock, we must close. Just a few words to thank you. Nothing happens in government unless the push comes from the top. This group is the top. I hope we can count on you for the push.

The meeting was then adjourned.

Mr. DRINAN. Counsel, could I come back to a point that I brought out before and think is very essential?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is about establishing or reestablishing the credibility of the Cabinet Committee, and I think it is fair to say that you are a surrogate of the Nixon administration, actively involved in the campaign over a long period of time. I quote what you said at Dallas in October or September. You attended a rally or an appreciation dinner for a Republican Congressman and Mr. Ramirez described Senator McGovern as a "Man from the Dakotas who never met a Mexican in his life." He went on to impugn the integrity of Mr. Shriver. You said that when he was Director of OEO, Mexicans had been left out of the poverty program and Shriver did that job.

You were also in Chicago on October 31 and you were to attend a rally sponsored by the Illinois Spanish Committee. And I could go on. I have other clippings here.

Do you think this helped or hurt the Committee that you directed?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, on the occasion of the appreciation dinner for my very good friend, distinguished Congressman Jim Collins, I had meetings with an attorney from Dallas regarding the city's development problems. I met on other occasions with many, many other——

Mr. DRINAN. We have your schedule here.

Would you answer the question?

Do you think you are becoming a surrogate of the Nixon administration, as other people did—Cabinet officers and what?

Do you think that it hurt or helped the credibility of the Cabinet Committee?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Mr. Congressman, in answer to your question regarding that trip to Dallas, Tex., I met with many persons who had questions concerning opportunities for Spanish-speaking Americans. I informed them of what was going on in Washington. Many of these people were leaders of the economic development group, OEO groups, and regional directors. We discussed how to open up more doors of opportunities. I think that these activities substantially helped our people and substantially assisted in carrying out the mandate of the law.

Mr. DRINAN. Do you think you violated the law in any way when you campaigned for Nixon and helped downgrade his political opposition as an individual designed to help the Spanish people and you took an active participation?

Dr. RAMIREZ. As an appointee of the President, there are times when one says somethings as one is traveling. I am sure that other people make comments and remarks about other persons in different situations. The primary job I have is to bring opportunities to our people. On that trip to Dallas and on other trips, that is exactly what I did. I spent my time working with these persons. In fact, Mr. Martinez and Mr. Sanchez and I met for about 3 hours that afternoon to discuss ways in which those regional offices could do a better job in New Mexico and Texas.

Mr. DRINAN. During the campaign, Spanish-speaking people in my congressional district in Framingham said to me that they thought Mr. Nixon had politicized the Cabinet Committee, and they made reference to your activities. I did not have any answer, and I did not want to attack the Cabinet Committee. They knew what you were doing, and they said that the President had misused Federal funds and they felt that it was wrong.

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, Father, the Cabinet Committee is very hard to politicize, because you are talking about HEW, HUD, and SBA.

Mr. DRINAN. The Secretary of HEW campaigned against me, so I am familiar with surrogates. I am not condoning that. All I am saying is: If it is so very special, should the Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights go out and campaign?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Why should a Spanish-speaking person who is a political appointee of the President be any different from an Anglo who was the head of the Department of Labor?

Mr. DRINAN. Well, I am not saying that it is right for him either.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, he is on the road.

Mr. DRINAN. Anyway, Dr. Ramirez, we do not mean to nag you on this. I want to establish or reestablish what 50,000 Spanish-speaking Americans in Boston think of this Cabinet Committee. It has a fantastic potential as you know better than we, and we are just trying to assist you.

Thank you.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Thank you.

Mr. PARKER. Dr. Ramirez, back to the committee meetings. Was there an agenda prepared for the Cabinet Committee when it met prior to the time that it met?

Dr. RAMIREZ. For the first meeting there were items to discuss with the President that needed his approval.

Mr. PARKER. I did not hear you.

Dr. RAMIREZ. I had some items for which I had acquired the approval of the President. We proceeded from there. I indicated that project blue and project alpha were the result of that conversation.

Mr. PARKER. That form was the agenda for the Cabinet meeting then?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes. Project Blue and Project Alpha.

Mr. PARKER. Are your staff reports prepared for the Cabinet Committee members?

Dr. RAMIREZ. My staff prepares reports to prepare me for the meeting. The other Committee members received in agenda which is prepared by my staff.

Mr. PARKER. Does the staff make certain recommendations that they would like to see the Cabinet Committee follow?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. PARKER. Do you, in turn, make certain recommendations to the Cabinet Committee?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. PARKER. It strikes me, Dr. Ramirez, that earlier this morning you talked about the difficulty in status of a sort, that, while you are called the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People, you do not actually have the status of Cabinet level, so you were not able to meet with other members of the Cabinet on a regular basis, and this is an informal arrangement.

It is possible that Congress, knowing that this might be a problem, mandated these four meetings so that you would have to meet and have the availability of the heads of the various Cabinet roles?

Dr. RAMIREZ. That is a good question for which I have no answer to.

Mr. PARKER. Well, I am going back to the earlier answer to my question.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As I understand, you attempted to call meetings but met with resistance or no response or at least no cooperation in terms of the liaison.

Dr. RAMIREZ. A great deal of cooperation. Efforts were made to bring these people together. You know and I know that it takes the President to bring these people together. They are very busy men.

Mr. PARKER. It takes the President and not the Congress passing the law?

Was it not pointed out to them that Congress itself had mandated and the President had signed this law?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I think they were very aware of that fact.

Mr. PARKER. In terms of the act itself, it also provides that there will be an advisory council on Spanish-speaking Americans established, which is appointed by the President from among individuals, who are representative of the Mexican American, Puerto Rican American, Cuban American, and other elements of the Spanish speaking and Spanish surnamed community in the United States.

As I read that directive, they really operate at the direction of the Chairman of the Cabinet Committee. Is that your understanding?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, it is.

Mr. PARKER. Can you tell me if you have given any directions to the Advisory Commission or requested their advice at any time?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, I have requested their advice.

Mr. PARKER. Formally or informally?

Dr. RAMIREZ. In our meetings that we would have——

Mr. PARKER. You have had meetings?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. PARKER. Could you tell me how often the Advisory Commission has met?

Dr. RAMIREZ. The Advisory Council has met about four times.

Mr. PARKER. Four times?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I believe it is four times, but I can submit that for the record.

Mr. PARKER. Can you supply us the dates?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes.

[The following information was submitted subsequent to the termination of the hearing:]

The Advisory Council has met three times since my appointment. The dates of these meetings were August 5, 1971, September 17, 1971, and April 19, 1972.

Mr. PARKER. Did you ask for specific things or give directions to the Advisory Council as to what areas you would require advice on?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I asked for their specific advice.

Mr. PARKER. And have they formulated that advice and returned it to you?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes. For example, I was asked, "What is your reaction to the Chairman of this Committee presenting as a priority item to members of the Committee the need to have departments and agencies begin to acquire and analyze data that reflects beneficiary recipients?" We discussed that for quite some time. We agreed that this was one of the very basic priorities in order that the Spanish-speaking people be able to move ahead.

Mr. PARKER. How do they formulate this advice? General discussion?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. RAMIREZ. General discussion.

Mr. PARKER. Do they have any staff of their own that is provided to them?

Dr. RAMIREZ. No. I asked them if they wanted to have their own staff, and they voted "No."

Mr. PARKER. Dr. Ramirez, you indicated that you received, in response to Congressman Drinan's question, several memos from the Committee to Reelect the President. Did you receive any similar memos from any Presidential candidate or otherwise?

Dr. RAMIREZ. No. I did receive verbal communications from the Democratic Central Committee.

Mr. PARKER. Are you referring to the Democratic National Committee?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes, from Polly Baca.

Mr. PARKER. Would these be requests for information?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Some of the requests were quite political; others were just requests for information, and some were just for general discussion purposes.

Mr. PARKER. You earlier this morning mentioned some $50 million in Federal grants which were given, I think, to first time grantees of which you were rather proud and related that to Cabinet Committee activity. Can you tell me in rather specific terms what the relationship is between the Cabinet Committee and those particular grants that you were referring to?

I mean, do you approve the grants? Do you have the funds to give the money? Or what is the relationship between the Cabinet Committee—or what role does it play in the granting of those sums of money to those grantees?

Dr. RAMIREZ. No direct relationship.

Mr. PARKER. None whatsoever?

Dr. RAMIREZ. No.

In our visit to the San Francisco regional office, we found that Spanish-speaking people were not receiving their fair share in the world of housing as were other groups. That there should be more equitable distribution of funds to Spanish-speaking people was brought to the attention of the regional director of HUD. As a result, some things happened. As we viewed the OEO situation in Chicago, Atlanta, New York, Dallas, and Denver, we found out that the Spanish-speaking people were not participating as they should have in these areas. So, our position was one of policy, suggesting that there be a redistribution of funds, so that the Spanish-speaking people, as American citizens, could participate in those programs that which were supposed to serve them, too.

Mr. PARKER. How were these recommendations made, Dr. Ramirez, by writing or informally?

Dr. RAMIREZ. They were made at meetings that were held in the regional conferences with the regional directors some recommendations were made verbally and some were made in writing.

Mr. RANGEL. Would the gentleman yield?

Were all of your suggestions in this area, to redistribute available funds rather than request additional funds?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dr. RAMIREZ. Our work was to deal with that which was. It was the same way in terms of available positions. That was our work, to deal with that which was.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, what was is bad.

Dr. RAMIREZ. That is right, and that is why we went out there.

Mr. RANGEL. It just seems to me that when you find people caught in the same bag, that you put in the task of poor people competing for nothing rather than bringing about some type of alliance where people can lobby to get at least a part or share in this Government.

We that represent black and Spanish-speaking communities, face it every day, and it just depends on which side of the avenue you are on as to what group is saying that the other one is taking everything. If your job is just to reallocate or redistribute, it just seems to me that somewhere along the line you should ask for—but I do not think that you need—you should show that this administration as other administrations has not properly taken care of the needs of the poor people, the Spanish speaking or otherwise.

I mean, if there is no housing going up in East Harlem, what the hell is there to distribute?

I mean, how would you deal with it? I am asking for direction; not to embarrass you. But how do you deal with it?

If they are cutting back on medical services and you want an equal share for Spanish-speaking people and they are closing down the facilities, how do you handle it with the administration?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I think I made the suggestion awhile ago about Congress providing for developing institutions. Although the money has not yet been totally divided between the minorities, the Spanish-speaking people appear to have received a very small share. Those are our concerns—that fairness be done.

Prior to 5 or 6 years ago, there were many programs, for example, Model Cities (HUD), Manpower training programs (OED), but we were not participating in these programs. So, we worked actively to be included. As a result $20 million was acquired for the first time in history. We are still working very hard to have Project SER's funding maintained and increased——

Mr. RANGEL. But it sounds so paternalistic, and I know that you do not mean for it to sound that way, that your Committee is merely doing for the people what you think is best for them.

Have you a liaison or some organization people in any given community so that they can fight for what is equitably theirs, even that which would include registering them to vote?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I think that it is very clear that we are to work with members of this committee to try to make sure that Spanish-speaking Americans participate in the opportunities documented in this report. The Spanish speaking have not been included, that is why we exist.

Mr. RANGEL. But you cannot meet with members of this Committee. They are very busy people and very important people. Because I do not know anybody in Congress that can meet with them.

Dr. RAMIREZ. The issue is whether or not the Spanish-speaking people will participate——

Mr. RANGEL. How can you get them to participate?

You can send out all the newsletters that you want.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If you split the available funds in any given project, 50-50, 50 percent to Spanish-speaking and 50 percent to the other, how do you get the Spanish-speaking people to make applications and to participate and enjoy the benefits of their tax-paid dollars?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Let me give you an example.

Now that the draft was winding down, the Department of Defense has many new programs to recruit Americans into the service.

Mr. RANGEL. That is for sure.

Dr. RAMIREZ. That is right. And I think that there are opportunities for those who wish to go into the services.

Mr. RANGEL. But the groups that you deal with do not have the same options as other groups.

Dr. RAMIREZ. May I respond to that?

I conducted a small survey to learn what methods were being utilized to recruit Spanish-speaking young people into the services. I found out that of the millions of dollars going to the media, very little, if any, was going to the Spanish-speaking media. Now, I think that is unfair.

Mr. RANGEL. Well, you can work out a deal with me to take that damned advertising in that media and put it in another media. I think it is a tragic indictment of this country to believe that helping people means to help them become a member of the military. I know that for many there are very few options. No. 1, there are the volunteers. But I do not hold myself out as a patriot.

Dr. RAMIREZ. I am aware of a Spanish newspaper that attempted to get four ads similar to those appearing in Ebony. I could not get those ads for them.

Mr. RANGEL. I can understand your need for trying to commercially get some bread for the Spanish-speaking magazine, but I still would like to believe that the aspirations of this Cabinet Committee go far beyond telling people how they can join up in the military.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, you said that, Congressman.

Mr. RANGEL. I hope that you share with the intention of my remarks. I just do not believe that you could walk away saying that we are increasing the Spanish-speaking involvement in the Marines 20 percent.

Mr. PARKER. Dr. Ramirez, how many employees does the Cabinet Committee——

Dr. RAMIREZ. You mean as of today?

Mr. PARKER. Yes. Any approximation.

Dr. RAMIREZ. It is around 35 or 37.

Mr. PARKER. Getting back to the Advisory Council for a moment. As I understand it, the nine members of the Advisory Council were appointed by President Nixon in August 1971. Does that sound accurate?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes.

Mr. PARKER. I also understand that they submitted resignations in 1972.

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes.

Mr. PARKER. At the present time, there are no members of the Advisory Council?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. PARKER. Was it communicated to you by any one of the nine members why they submitted their resignations?

Mr. RAMIREZ. Why?

Mr. PARKER. Why.

Mr. RAMIREZ. I think that they were asked to resign.

Mr. PARKER. They were asked to resign by the President and their resignations were then accepted by the White House?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I do not know the status. No action has been taken on mine either.

Mr. PARKER. In other words, yours has not been acted on either?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I do not believe it has.

Mr. PARKER. Are they still——

Dr. RAMIREZ. My information is that the resignations were acted upon and accepted.

Mr. PARKER. Have there been any new appointments made to replace them?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I understand that and the selection process is going on at this time. I am not a party to that.

Mr. PARKER. I have some further questions, Mr. Chairman, but I notice that it is now 12 noon.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Blommer?

Mr. BLOMMER. I have no questions.

Mr. WIGGINS. I have just a few minor matters on some of these questions to put them into perspective.

You were appointed by the President, Mr. Ramirez?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes.

Mr. WIGGINS. Confirmed by the Senate?

Dr. RAMIREZ. That is correct.

Mr. WIGGINS. Have you been advised by your counsel whether or not you are covered by the Hatch Act?

Dr. RAMIREZ. I have been informed that I am not covered by the Hatch Act.

Mr. WIGGINS. You are specifically exempted by an act of Congress for engaging in political activities?

I would observe, Mr. Chairman, that it would be difficult to hold Dr. Ramirez up to a higher standard of conduct than we have ever held any other Presidential appointee in the history of any administration.

My information, which is wholly in the folder, is, Dr. Ramirez, that you received a communication from Alex Armendariz, who personally worked for the Committee To Reelect the President, requesting you to review a survey which was attached to that communication and that you put it in the wastebasket. Is that correct?

Dr. RAMIREZ. No I did no respond to that one. I had that one on my desk, and the next thing I knew it was out. Now, you know that we have an agency that is a very public place and people come in and go. We have Spanish-speaking people from throughout the country visiting us at all times. It is not a security place; it is not a place where we have policemen and security officers, and someone evidently found this one. It got out through another source, an interesting source. I did not even realize that it had been around. I read it once and put it to one side.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The next thing I knew it was in the papers. It came out from another source, a very interesting source. So, I wonder how it got over there.

Mr. WIGGINS. The important thing is what you did in response to it, not necessarily where you put it.

Would you tell the committee what your response was to this invitation?

Dr. RAMIREZ. To this memo?

Mr. WIGGINS. Yes.

Dr. RAMIREZ. I did not agree with the observations in the memo. I did not like the observations made in it. I did not answer it.

Mr. WIGGINS. Were you a part of the informal structure of the Committee To Reelect the President?

Dr. RAMIREZ. No.

Mr. WIGGINS. I do not know what to make of this, Mr. Chairman. Are there any facts before this committee that suggest he has been politicizing his agency, so that I can examine him on those facts?

Mr. EDWARDS. The only information that we have, Mr. Wiggins, is in the information that we are developing here in connection with the activities of the chairman of the committee and his staff.

At no time did any member of this committee not understand that you were not covered. We agree that you were not covered by the Hatch Act. I personally feel—and I am speaking only for myself—that it is absolutely relevant that this committee examine the activities of your committee.

Mr. WIGGINS. I agree with that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. Also, I think it is not necessarily wrong that we point out that this distinguished gentleman traveled throughout the country and made quite a number of efforts to reelect President Nixon.

Now, he says that, and that is why he is not covered by the Hatch Act. However, I think that it should be made a matter of record that it is important for us to realize this, that he did.

Mr. WIGGINS. Well, I accept the chairman's statement. What we do not have is a concession that you have done wrong, but we just want to talk about it. Apparently, I find myself unable to really ask any pointed questions in the field.

Can you volunteer any information which you might suggest that an amendment to the laws might be proposed which would preclude this unique officer of the Presidential appointed office from doing what other Presidential appointees have done since time immemorial?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Along both lines, no, because if you are going to be part of the official family that the taxpayers charge was governing them, then the closer you are with the President the more effective you are going to be in helping to provide opportunities—in this case, helping to govern. I would not change that part.

Again, I might repeat that it really concerns me that instead of looking at these areas that are so important for the Spanish-speaking people, the enforcement of these laws that have been such dismal failures—here we are talking about how a few remarks by the chairman, very legitimate remarks, while in the course of meeting with hundreds and thousands of community leaders, organizations throughout this country and providing opportunity, informing them of what is avail-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

able at their request, at their invitation in every instance, can then be turned around and a question be made along that line. I think this committee is doing wonderful work. I believe that we have the obligation to continue to help this committee bring these benefits to our people.

I want to cooperate and help in every way that I can.

Mr. WIGGINS. I regard this discussion as really becoming very peripheral.

Mr. EDWARDS. You must remember, Mr. Wiggins, and accept that these were official business trips, paid for by the American taxpayers, and I think, really, it would not be appropriate to make political speeches while you are traveling with the Committee on Committee budget. I do not want to abuse this point——

Mr. WIGGINS. I am sure, however, that the committee would look into the question of the legitimacy of this trip.

Is it true that you traveled at public expense for the purpose of making such political speeches and that was the sole reason for being there?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Anytime I traveled for the sole purpose of making a political speech, the trips were not paid for by the Federal Government.

The trips that I made vary in no way from the first trip that I made as a recently appointed official to meet community leaders or meet with organizations, to look at schools, projects and federally funded programs. I talked to many, many people throughout this country. I listened to their concerns, and their requests. I brought some of them to Washington in order to work and act upon their suggestions.

If I said some things during those trips, they were incidental.

As an appointee of the President, I am expected to respond if people ask, "What is the President doing; what is the administration doing over here?" Whether these are political or not is a matter of judgment, no matter what people call them.

Mr. WIGGINS. I do not think the charge has been made, at least it has not been made in my presence, that these trips were for the purpose of furthering the election of the President.

These speeches apparently were incidental to the legitimate purposes of the visit; is that true?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes.

Mr. WIGGINS. Let me move on to another area, an area that is more important.

My colleague, Mr. Rangel, raised some questions that should be explored. I gather from his remarks that there needs to be an effective organizing influence among Spanish speaking in various communities to advise them the manner in which they can take advantage of the Federal programs and partake of the political process. That there should be something in the nature of a Federal ombudsman to help serve these people, because without this guidance they would not know how to so avail themselves.

Do you want to respond to that, whether that is a wise course, what suggestions you may have in that regard?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Well, I feel that the Spanish-speaking people are ultimately going to participate in the opportunities in this country most

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

fully and most effectively when they become aware of the processes that make things happen in this country. When we are a part of the Government at the city, county and State levels, when we are at the middle and senior levels of policy and management, when all this happens, we will begin to fully participate.

To organize on the outside as other interest-group organizations have, is not the function of a Government agency. I do not believe it is the function of this agency to create outside pressure groups. I do not believe that that is what the American taxpayers are paying for. I may be wrong.

Mr. WIGGINS. I agree with that. And time is fleeing here, and I do not believe it is appropriate for Government to fund a lobbying group against itself.

Let me make this comment. In my experience, Dr. Ramirez, in southern California, of which you are intimately aware, the Mexican Americans for the first time are starting to get a piece of the political action at the local level. The Mexican Americans are participating on the school board, really for the first time, participating as members of the city council for the first time. I regard this as very helpful, because that is really where the action is. I do not know it has been attributed at all or in part to the activity of your agency, but I regard it as encouraging for the future of Spanish-speaking Americans.

Mr. EDWARDS. Time is fleeing, but the committee is going to meet again on this subject with different witnesses on the 19th.

Again, Dr. Ramirez, let me emphasize that this subcommittee of the Judiciary intends to report to the full committee on the work that you are doing. We think that the work you are doing is very important. We think it is for the benefit of Congress to look at it across the table.

We asked on May 29 for a copy of the speeches and you did not respond. Can you furnish us a copy of that?

Dr. RAMIREZ. Yes; I can.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you very much, Dr. Ramirez.

The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:15 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

THURSDAY, JULY 19, 1973

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
CIVIL RIGHTS AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in room 2237, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Don Edwards [chairman of the subcommittee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Edwards, Waldie, Rangel, Wiggins, and McClory.

Also present: Alan A. Parker, counsel; Michael W. Blommer, associate counsel; and Linda Chavez, staff analyst.

Mr. EDWARDS. The subcommittee will come to order.

The Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights Subcommittee meets again today to hear testimony on the Cabinet Committee's Role in Providing Equal Opportunity for Spanish-Speaking People. Last week we heard testimony from Mr. Henry Ramirez, Chairman of the Cabinet Committee, and today we will hear from representatives of Spanish-speaking organizations.

We will focus today on ways in which this subcommittee can assist the Cabinet Committee in carrying out its mandate and its responsibilities to the Spanish-speaking community. Our interest is not to criticize the Cabinet Committee for its own sake, but to oversee that the Cabinet Committee functions as Congress intended and is responsive to the very real needs of Spanish-speaking Americans in this country. As Mr. Ramirez so ably stated it at our hearings, the Cabinet Committee represents 12 million Spanish-speaking persons who suffer many and diverse problems. This subcommittee should address itself to what the Cabinet Committee has done, to quote Mr. Ramirez, "to right the wrongs" dealt the Spanish speaking. That is exactly what we are attempting to do.

Before I ask the witness to come up, Mr. Wiggins, do you have any statement that you wish to make.

Mr. WIGGINS. I have no statement.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Waldie?

Mr. WALDIE. I have no statement.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Rangel?

Mr. RANGEL. No, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. We have with us today Mr. Alex Zermeno, assistant executive director of the National Council of La Raza. We also have

p 48 blank

0052

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Ms. Raquel Marquez Frankel representing the Spanish-Speaking Coalition on Domestic Affairs, Mr. William P. Vasquez, director of La Causa Comun, and Ms. Cheryl Keyser of Mujeres en Accion. We will also have statements for the record from Dr. Hilda Hidalgo, chairman of the Department of Urban Studies at Rutgers University and a former member of the Advisory Council, and Mr. Juan Rocha, director of Washington operations for the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund.

I want to welcome you here today and look forward to your testimony.

Good morning. Delighted to have you with us, and you may proceed with your testimony.

TESTIMONY OF ALEX ZERMENO, ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF LA RAZA

Mr. EDWARDS. May I interrupt you, do you have any more copies of your statement?

Mr. ZERMENO. Yes, I think they are——

Mr. EDWARDS. Does each member have a copy?

Thank you. You may proceed.

Mr. ZERMENO. Chairman Edwards, distinguished members of this committee, I am Alex Zermeno, deputy director of the National Council of La Raza, speaking on behalf of Henry Santiestevan, national director of the National Council of La Raza. We thank you for your invitation to appear before this committee on the subject of this hearing.

It is with a great deal of frustration that the National Council of La Raza listened to the testimony presented at the hearing of the Cabinet Committee on opportunities for Spanish-speaking people last week.

It is not easy or pleasant to discuss critically a governmental organization established to help our own people. But, we will not abandon our responsibility to those whom we represent, those to whom we must answer—the Spanish speaking in the barrios and the colonias of this Nation.

So we stand ready, to say in their behalf, that the time has come for an accounting of what is being done in the name of the Spanish speaking in this country.

As representatives of many Mexican Americans, we believe that the Spanish speaking have a right to know in specific terms what the Cabinet Committee is accomplishing. We believe that the Spanish speaking have to know if the committee's success is being blocked by alleged political manipulation.

Time and again community leaders have told us they believe that the chairman of the Cabinet Committee is directly responsible for securing grants and funds for projects involving them. Yet, last week the chairman testified that the Cabinet Committee has no such power or authority.

What, then, is being done with the $900,000 budget allocated to the committee? That is the question we hear from our people. It is a fair question to ask.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is frustrating to know that while the money is being spent, there is little evidence that the committee is independent or powerful enough to use itself to deal directly with the hard core issues confronting our people.

With administration approval, the committee in fiscal year 1972 embarked on two programs: Project Blue and Project Alpha. The first was designed to establish goals and timetables which would insure equitable Spanish-speaking participation in employment, program deliveries, procurement and contract compliance.

The second entailed a series of regional conferences with the objective of reviewing the problems of Spanish-speaking communities and assessing Federal responsiveness to Spanish-speaking problems and needs.

Yet the progress of both is difficult to assess because of lack of data. The fiscal year 1972 report states "that the present data collection and retrieval systems are inadequate at both the national and regional levels."

Without adequate data collection and retrieval systems, it is difficult to assess that Federal programs are reaching the Spanish-speaking. In seeking new programs designed to service the unique needs of the Spanish-speaking, these systems are equally vital.

We share the frustrations which the Cabinet Committee suffers in doing its job without such tools.

Now we are told by the Cabinet Committee that its projections for fiscal year 1973 will be devoted to employment and a collection of recipient-beneficiary data by ethnicity. We are told that it is planning tentatively to reserve the right to say "no" to requests for assistance from the Spanish-speaking.

Tentatively, we are also told the Cabinet Committee is planning to say "no" to problems dealing with the young, the old, law enforcement and drug abuse, and possibly to other areas of need.

Our overriding concern on this front is twofold:

1. Will this create a void? How has the committee in the past dealt with these issues?

2. To what will the committee now say yes, and to what has it been saying yes?

After reviewing the situation, the leaders of the National Council of La Raza have come to believe that perhaps what is sorely needed is a restructuring of the committee with greater emphasis placed on the work at the regional level.

With decentralization of Government and revenue sharing currently taking effect in this country, is it not better to move strength to the people instead of it remaining in an office in Washington, D.C.?

Shouldn't specific projects be generated for the Spanish-speaking along with the reporting and reprocessing of Civil Service employment figures, census data, and grant announcements?

Is it not better to provide a vehicle through which the Spanish-speaking in this Nation can draw up their own priorities and in effect direct and guide the committee toward the pressing needs and problems affecting them?

Poverty, inadequate and substandard housing, inferior and unequal education, and poor health conditions plague our people. How does

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the Cabinet Committee address itself to these pressing issues other than by recycling Federal data secured by Federal agencies?

It is indeed frustrating to see that the only formally legislated vehicle in this country for the Spanish speaking has such difficulty serving the people for whom it was created.

There can be no service when there is no enforcing power.

What kind of power do you call it when the head of the committee cannot even gather together a meeting to discuss what must be done to rectify the prejudice and inequities faced by millions of Spanish speaking each and every day?

Our people wonder why the Cabinet Committee, which by law is to meet quarterly, does not?

A meeting called by the Cabinet Committee this week in the midst of congressional investigations into it, cannot hide the inadequacies of the past.

To prevent such shortcomings in the future, however, a watchdog measure must be incorporated into the committee structure to guarantee that progress is being made. I suggest that a nonpartisan coalition of Spanish-speaking leaders be called to meet with the committee to set up measurable objectives facilitating accountability.

Our people were hopeful when Public Law 91-81, setting up the committee, was passed and enacted. The law was necessary to assure that our people would share in the American lifestream.

But, like all other laws, it is useless unless enforced.

We share the frustrations of the chairman and this committee. But, let us look to the future with a new focus that can be held accountable.

Let us review, rebuild, and redirect our efforts on behalf of the Spanish speaking in this country.

But, let us never say no to them.

The Spanish speaking in this Nation need answers, they need action in the States where they live and they need representation in Washington. A governmental vehicle could help. If the committee is to be that vehicle, then the time has come to guarantee that it will function effectively.

The National Council of La Raza stands prepared to help build that vehicle, to work with whatever vehicle that may be. We know, however, that the barrios and colonias are moving in new directions as never before. Leadership is growing and positive strides are being made for and with the Spanish speaking in this Nation. We are confident that inroads for our people will be made by this community leadership, if by no one else.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you very much, Mr. Zermeno.

I find that information very helpful and your statement a very affirmative statement.

I am sure the members of the committee applaud the creative aspects of your statement.

Inasmuch as we have with us really four experts, in this important area this morning, I wonder if there would be any objection of the other members, of the subcommittee if we could hear the statements of all four witnesses and then engage in dialog with them that would be in the nature of questions and answers and discussion.

Is there any objection?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

If not, then we will hear next from Ms. Frankel, representing the Spanish-Speaking Coalition on Domestic Affairs.

TESTIMONY OF RAQUEL FRANKEL, SPANISH-SPEAKING COALITION ON DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

Ms. FRANKEL. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have been requested by Mr. John Flores, who is the president of the coalition, to give his statement to you this morning along with his apologies for being unable to attend it.

His statement is as follows: Today we are here to address ourselves to an issue of vital importance to the Spanish-speaking community of this country, an issue of which was established in 1968 by the late President Lyndon Johnson as a result of the Federal Government's realization that it had not addressed itself to this, but rather had neglected the responsibilities that our Government had toward the Spanish-speaking community.

This is a Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for Spanish-Speaking People. This committee, as we all know, was created to insure that the Federal programs, in fact, do reach the Mexican American, the Puerto Rican, the Cuban and other Spanish speaking and Spanish surnamed Americans. It is also to provide the assistance required to seek out the new programs which are necessary to help solve the problems that are unique to this community.

Mr. Chairman, when this vehicle was established, we felt that special goals had been reached and new commitments had been made and hopes were truly lifted. It was the beginning of the reality that would assure participation by Spanish-speaking community and it was a promising voice in helping to determine the destiny of our own lives.

We are here again today, addressing ourselves to the need for such a vehicle.

Mr. Chairman, I am certain that all of us agree that such a vehicle is necessary and shall continue to be necessary as long as the Spanish-speaking have not achieved the goals that this country is supposed to guarantee, that is equality in all areas of life, equality in education, equality in employment, equality in housing, equality in the health services, equality in economic development and equality of opportunity in helping to mold this country of ours into a true democracy.

The intent and purpose of this vehicle must continue. The intent and purpose of this vehicle must prevail.

I feel certain that I can speak for many who share the same view, that in order for this concept, this vehicle to succeed, it must be strengthened, not weakened. One fact we perceive as strengthening this vehicle is to provide for the accountability, and accountability that is not only to the Federal Government, but also to the Spanish-speaking people whom they exist to serve.

I ask of you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this committee for opportunity for the Spanish-speaking community to address itself to this accountability. I ask this committee to allow the Spanish-speaking the necessary time to write and introduce legislation and/or to make specific recommendations that will assure the accountability which we all desire.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

We feel that this is the time to ascertain that people who are recipients of benefits secured by this Agency also have a voice in how these benefits will be measured.

Almost 200 years ago, a bell called the Liberty Bell rang for independence in this country and the peal of that bell proclaimed the principles that all men are created equal, entitled to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness.

This was the declaration on which this country was founded as men sacrificed and toiled to achieve these goals. So, has the Spanish-speaking communities sacrificed and toiled to see that these principles were obtained for their community.

All of this work must not end and must not be in vain. We hope that God will grant you and this committee the wisdom and guidance necessary to insure that the rights and principles for which so many have struggled will not fail but instead we shall go forward to make this country a true model of a nation that will not compromise principles nor objectives to which all citizens are equally entitled.

We stand ready to assist in any way possible.

Thank you for the kind attention and allowing us to speak before you on behalf of Mr. John Flores, national chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you, very much, Ms. Frankel, for an excellent statement.

[The prepared statement of John A. Flores follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN A. FLORES, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL SPANISH-SPEAKING COALITION ON DOMESTIC AFFAIRS, FRESNO, CALIF.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, Ladies, and Gentlemen, today we are here to address ourselves to an issue that is of vital importance to the Spanish-speaking communities of this country. The issue is the vehicle that was established in 1967 by the late President Johnson, as a result of the Federal Government realizing that it had not addressed itself to, but rather neglected the responsibilities our government has to the Spanish-speaking community. This vehicle is the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish Speaking People. This Cabinet is, as we all know, to assure that Federal programs do in fact reach the Mexican American, the Puerto Rican American, the Cuban American, and all other Spanish-speaking and Spanish surnamed Americans to provide the assistance they need to seek out new programs that are necessary to handle problems that are unique to them.

Mr. Chairman, when this vehicle was established in the minds of many of us a goal had been reached, a commitment had been made, and the hopes of many had been lifted. It was the beginning of a reality that would assure participation from the Spanish-speaking community in this country of ours, and a voice in the destination of our lives. Here we are today addressing ourselves to the need of such a vehicle.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all of us have to agree that such a vehicle is necessary, and will continue to be necessary so long as the Spanish-speaking community falls short of the goals this country is suppose to guarantee—and this is equality in all areas of life: equality in education, equality in employment, equality in housing, equality in health services, equality in economic development, and equality in helping mold this country of ours into a true democracy.

The intent and purpose of this vehicle must continue. The intent and purpose of this vehicle must achieve. I feel certain I speak for many who share the same opinion that in order for this idea, this vehicle to succeed, it must be strengthened and not weakened. We are also certain that accountability for this vehicle lies not only from the Federal Government but also from the Spanish-speaking community which it is suppose to serve.

I ask of you Mr. Chairman, and Members of this Committee, for an opportunity for the Spanish-speaking community to address itself to this accountability. I ask this Committee to allow the Spanish-speaking community the nec-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

essary time to write and introduce legislation and make recommendations that will assure the accountability that all of us desire. We feel that this must be done to insure the people, who are to receive the benefits, a voice in how these benefits will be measured. Almost 200 years ago a bell, called the Liberty Bell, rang for independence in this country, and the ring of this bell was based on principles that all men were created equal and entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Mr. Chairman, this declaration that the bell proclaimed still lives, and with it lives the principles of that document on which this country was founded. As men sacrificed and toiled to achieve these goals, so has the Spanish-speaking community sacrificed and toiled to see that these same principles be applied to our community. All of this work must not, and it will not, be in vain and I hope that God gives you and your committee, as well as the Congress of these United States, the wisdom and guidance that is necessary to insure that these rights and principles, that so many of us have given so much for, will not fail but will go forward and make this country of ours a true model of a nation that will not compromise these objectives and principles to which all citizens are equally entitled.

Thank you very much for your kind attention and in allowing us to speak before you. On behalf of the Spanish Speaking Coalition on Domestic Affairs, we stand ready to assist in any way possible.

Mr. EDWARDS. We will now hear from Mr. William P. Vasquez, president, La Causa Comun.

TESTIMONY OF WILLIAM P. VASQUEZ, PRESIDENT, LA CAUSA COMUN; ACCOMPANIED BY K. W. MAY, STAFF ASSISTANT

Mr. VASQUEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for extending the invitation to me, and to other fellow Latinos, to appear and testify before this subcommittee on matters pertaining to the President's Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking People.

I am William P. Vasquez, president of La Causa Comun, a Puerto Rican organization, one of two struggling Puerto Rican organizations located in Washington, D.C. My organization's primary concerns deal with the needs of Latinos in the Northeast and Great Lakes regions. The constituency that we seek to represent are the Puertorriquenos, a people continuously overlooked in most public affairs. This very simply means that we work with a very poor and neglected people, and community organizations that assist in this work.

I would like to note emphatically, before I proceed into the main statement, that La Causa Comun—which should be translated into something like "the Community's Cause"—is a nonpartisan Puerto Rican organization—testifying here today in unity with my fellow Latino brothers and sisters.

In late 1969, Congress created the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking People. Many in our communities believed that this new Government agency would finally provide for the needed recognition of the interests of the Latino population in the United States. It was hoped that the Nation's second largest ethnic minority, now some 15 million Latinos, would finally have the advocate within our Government's system. And it was widely held that the new interagency committee would gradually be invested with increased authority, power, and responsibility. Others, like Congressman Gonzales, criticizing the powerlessness of the new committee, stated at that time, "that a committee of this kind can probably do nothing that would not have been done anyway."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Over the past few years and months, numerous hopes and aspirations have been terminated. The greatest casualty of the political processes of this period, has been the belief that Latinos would be systematically included in the economic and social developments and policies of our Federal Government. All too many of us had presumed that the Federal Government, in establishing a Cabinet Committee, was making its first step in that direction. Instead, we Latinos have had to begin to realize that the Cabinet Committee itself did not grow with the times. Its authority, power, and responsibility are virtually the same as in 1969. Hopefully, with the recent increase in Cabinet actions and activities, there will also be increased authority for the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People.

If it was merely a case of some obscure administrative committee failing to increase its scope of influence within Government, that is, if the question of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People was simply an administrative matter or bureaucratic issue, no concerned citizen, and no Congressman, would appear before, or hold a hearing.

Because we are a smaller minority group, "the second-largest" minority, there may be some who think that the Latino issue is a minor matter, having no large-scale implications, and the country "can rest assured that there will be no problems." The problem is a little bit deeper than that, because the losers in the game of policymaking, legislation, appropriations, and administration, are not simply—or even primarily—the Latinos. All of America become the losers. Without seeking to be dramatic or rhetorical, it is clear that the well-being of millions of people, and thousands of communities, and city, county, and other local governments, is at stake. The poverty of a few hundred or a few thousand Latinos in one area, will affect the state of affairs and the course of action of that area's local government. It affects the resources of local taxpayers—Latinos and non Latinos alike. Multiply the problems facing many local communities and local governments by several thousand, and we arrive at a massive problem facing the United States as a whole, and Latinos in particular. Many of us feel obliged, there, to ask this simple question: "Since when does a Nation accept solving a massive problem through a 'committee' that has no authority and no power?" That, however, is precisely the situation. There are some who say that we should and must "now" focus on State and local governments to help our communities move ahead. That is what we Latinos have done for generations. We will, of course, continue to work on and seek programs through these levels. Yet, I should note that many a State and local unit of government continues to hold that the Latino question is solely a matter of "Federal responsibility!"

There is no doubt that a Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People would have innumerable problems today, even if it did have substantial authority and power on the Federal level. The "New Federalists" and their policies of decentralization and revenue sharing tell us—and in some communities, condemn us—to work through local government institutions, which have proven themselves to be least responsive to these local needs. It is for this reason that Latinos, and not only Latinos, or the poor, seek direction and

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

assistance from the Federal Government. And it is presumably for this reason that the Cabinet Committee was created and maintained during the present administration.

The needs, interests, and concerns of the people of America have never been "federalized"—our major needs, interests, and concerns have never left home! The real work is always done on local levels. That is the case with respect to all minorities, as well as all people of America. The concerns of Americans are already "decentralized!" Our hopes are very local! Yet, the problems we face are national in scope. The issues which we seek to solve are national in scope.

"Decentralization," carried to its logical conclusion, would—for example—mean the defederalization of military defense (military revenue sharing?), and the elimination of countless of controls by the Federal Government in areas of finance, commerce, social security agriculture, even foreign trade. This would, of course, have some profound effects on the very nature of our Government, create massive problems, and bring us right back to Federal direction. All I am saying is that revenue sharing and decentralization is presenting some very grave and serious problems for communities, analogous to the effect of decentralization in other areas. I have asked myself, what would happen if some major industry, like ITT, was told by some interagency committee that ITT should deal solely with the local county and city governments, and that the committee can and will do nothing to help the company? ITT, of course, has the power and resources to deal with this, although it might face some grave problems at local levels. Now imagine some small powerless community group being told the same by this interagency committee. A community is at a great disadvantage.

Without attempting to go too far astray from the subcommittee's goals with respect to its hearings, I am merely seeking to point to the root of the problem facing Latinos, as I see it. The Cabinet Committee is now in the position of becoming a toothless paper tiger. Unless its scope of authority, power, and responsibility is increased to take account of the needs of the Latino communities and of the impact of decentralization, the statement by Congressman Gonzales, made at the beginning, will hold true! There would then be no reason, that is, no practical or economic reason, for its continued existence. It is a sad commentary indeed on the commitment to Latinos by the Federal Government, that this may have been the situation for sometime already.

I cannot believe that this was or is the intent of Congress; nor am I convinced that our Nation's Chief Executive has been fully apprised of the real needs, interests, and concerns of the Latino. Further, we have no reason to believe that the Cabinet Committee itself is fully cognizant of these needs, interests, and concerns. If there is one thing that the latter is aware of, however, it is that more and more Latinos are losing faith in America's ability, or willingness, to systematically include them in the progress of our Nation.

Let there be no doubt about the fact that most Latinos are prepared for the long road, and hard work and sacrifice, to achieve progress and attain success. We would like dramatic changes, from the present situation where most of the country's Latinos are living below or near the Federal poverty levels, to at least those conditions which most Ameri-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

cans would find acceptable as "the minimum." Is that too much of an opportunity?

I have briefly pointed to the concern related to the powerlessness of the Cabinet Committee. Power, however, implies a responsibility on the part of an agency towards the constituency which it serves. A regulatory agency, such as the Federal Communications Commission, responds to various national concerns, not only governmental. The same case exists with respect to the other numerous consumer-focused agencies. To be sure, perfection is not generally expected—but there are, at least, significant opportunities for consumer inputs and influence. This factor of "accountability" is virtually absent from the Cabinet Committee's activities.

Authority in a democratic institution is balanced by accountability. Indeed, such authority is strengthened by accountability, for among many things, faith in authority becomes restored when people and communities know their views get a hearing. The Cabinet Committee should be setting the pace for other agencies on this issue. If the committee does not provide leadership, can we expect other agencies—of the Departments—to do so? Accountability to Latin communities is a prerequisite to effective Cabinet Committee activities and functions. It also increases the responsibilities of the Latin communities and their leadership.

Three major concerns have been noted in this testimony: The need for increased authority, the need for increased accountability, and the need to make funding processes—for example, revenue sharing—work for the Spanish speaking. If the "New Federalism" does not work to facilitate opportunities for the Spanish speaking, then new measures and approaches are needed.

There is a fourth major concern that should be kept in mind in dealing with the needs of Hispanic Americans: the inadequacy of census data.

This hearing is not the time and place to delve heavily into the above question. I mention it only because census data, when used to (1) determine funding of services, or (2) the amount of funds available for investment purposes, and for other purposes, will inherently result in inequities for the Spanish speaking. In short, the primary use, of census data for the purpose of achieving parity in allocating funds, may in most areas of the country be discriminatory, and thus probably unconstitutional. It may eventually turn out that the whole "New Federalism" approach, from general to special revenue sharing and other administrative decentralization approaches is discriminatory. This appears, on the face of it, as rather incredible. The indicators are there, however! It could mean a host of class action suits in every local and State government. It would be ironic, as well as tragic, that we Latinos are faced with the prospect of massive legal onslaughts in order to insure our rights as citizens, as taxpayers. Again, the losers are not simply the Latinos—but society at large, including State and local governments. American society is the loser!

The great irony of the Latino question in the United States is that the longer Latinos' interests and needs are not recognized and responded to, the more costly it is becoming for the Nation. Need I recount the sad crime statistics, unemployment rates, and the host of

0061

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

other unsavory features of the ghettos and barrios; and above all, the waste of human talent and resources and the misery of so many of my people? Do we deserve this? Does America deserve this?

There are no grandiose solutions. I do, however, wish to present some simple suggestions or recommendations that relate to the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People. I will be happy to further elaborate on them in writing, should this be valuable to the subcommittee's efforts.

The accompanying recommendations constitute, in effect, a new 16-point program for the Spanish speaking. They would provide new life, vibrancy, hope, and direction and goals for the Spanish-speaking people and for the Cabinet Committee. The time has come for the old 16-point program to evolve into a new thrust. The suggestions proposed here merely supplement the old program.

Just as this Nation and its institutions evolve, so also the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People must evolve and mature as a stable and responsible instrument of the American public and its Government.

I would like to submit here as the first of many issues, that a newly constituted Cabinet Committee needs to address itself to the struggle for human rights and economic development, and for the constitutional right to organize, by Cesar Chavez and the many Spanish-speaking farmworkers on the west coast. The capacity of the Cabinet Committee to objectively deal with this long-neglected area of deep concern to the million of Spanish-speaking American citizens and voters would be a most significant step in the right direction for opportunities for all Spanish-speaking people in our country.

I am also submitting, for your information, a copy of our analysis of the Cabinet Committee's fiscal year 1972 report. Our brief analysis of this recent report may shed light on a number of additional questions and concerns.

Again, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to address the committee on matters of concern to all the citizens of the United States.

Mr. Edwards. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Vasquez. That is certainly a complete and helpful statement and we will include in the record, without objection, the enclosures, the 16-point program for the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking People and your review of the annual report for the fiscal year 1972 of the Cabinet Committee.

[The report and program follow:]

A REVIEW OF THE ANNUAL REPORT—FISCAL YEAR 1972 OF THE CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR SPANISH-SPEAKING PEOPLE

During 1973, the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities For Spanish-speaking People submitted a twenty page report for the 1972 fiscal year. The purpose of this review is to present a brief critique of this Report.

The Administration's role in Hispanic American Affairs seem to have been severely curtailed for nearly three years subsequent to 1968. Among other factors that played a role, is the fact that an Advisory Council for the Cabinet Committee, established by P.L. 91-181 on December 30, 1969 was not formed until late 1971. Further, from December 1970 to August 1971, the Cabinet Committee had no chairman, although the President had enunciated in November 1970 his 16 Point Program on federal employment for the Spanish-speaking. For a significant length of time, therefore, the Cabinet Committee lacked both administrative direction and control, as well as input from Spanish-speaking communities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

During this critical formative period of the major new administrative and legislative directions in the domestic field—from 1969 to 1971—Hispanic Americans had virtually no influence or input on policy-making and their implementation in the present Administration. A major conclusion to be drawn from this is that the above "directions" could but be undertaken in a vacuum of decision-making, which neglected or ignored, or did not take significant account of, Spanish-speaking Americans' interests. Thus, for example, the impact of general revenue sharing, special revenue sharing, and decentralization, was not assessed from the perspective of the needs of Hispanic American communities. The Cabinet Committee's FY 1972 Report indicates, by the absence of consideration of the above areas, e.g. decentralization of government operations, that the Administration, including the Cabinet Committee, have yet to consider that perspective and its full implications. The Committee, which could have been an important Administration tool for an assessment or reassessment, apparently played no role, or was not asked to play a role, to assist in the formulation of New Federalism policies and thrusts. It, therefore, did not deal with the systematic inclusion of Hispanic American peoples' developmental needs and goals within the Administration's New Federalism.

What role(s) then could the Cabinet Committee play, if not a key policymaking one? The Committee was relegated into three major areas of action: (1) assisting Spanish-speaking groups and organizations, or corporations, in the acquisition of federal contracts and grants—primarily during the year 1972; (2) the implementation of the President's 16 Point Program; and (3) increasing public and Congressional awareness of the needs of Spanish-speaking people.

The extent to which the Cabinet Committee was successful in these endeavors, will become measurable with the release of the FY 1973 Report of the Cabinet Committee, and subsequent to a thorough evaluation of the Civil Service Commission's performance under the 16 Point Program. The cumulative effect of Administration efforts for the Spanish-speaking appears to have been concentrated on FY 1972 and the first half of FY 1973. To what extent the Cabinet Committee lent itself to a systematic development of Hispanic American communities, through facilitating the funding of programs, particularly multi-year programs, in the diverse areas of the country, is not clear. Nor is it clear, from the 1972 Report, what specific role, if any, the Cabinet Committee played in grantsmanship and contract awards.

The 1972 Report does not give the appearance that the Committee was able to mount an effective effort towards the equitable distribution of funds, nor does it appear to have been able to mount a significant effort towards increasing the sources of funds available for Hispanic American communities. On the other hand, it is not clear whether the hands of the Committee were so tied by a policy-decision of the Administration setting maximum ceiling levels on funds set aside for contracts and grants for Hispanic Americans, that the Cabinet Committee could do little to remedy the situation. The FY 1972 Report does point out that "Funding commitments were made by each Regional Council to sustain programming proposals submitted as part of each Region's Action Plan. Agencies notified Regional Offices of funds available." What the level of funding was is not indicated by the Report, although it notes that by April 1972, only 45 million dollars were identified for projects devoted to the needs of Hispanic Americans. There is no indication that the funding was done on a systematic level, following particular developmental priorities.

The second role, concerning the implementation of the 16 Point Program, may ultimately allow for a more thorough evaluation of the Administration's level of commitment to systematically facilitate: (1) upward mobility of the Spanish-speaking in the civil service sector of federal government, and (2) participation of the Spanish-speaking in the decision-making of policy-making processes of the Administration on various levels of federal government. Such an assessment, however, needs to be done in the context of the Administration's overall administrative goals—including regionalization, decentralization, revenue-sharing—which focus on a reorientation of policy- and decision-making away from federal government, into state and local units of government; away from federal funding of social and related service programs and developmental activities in manpower, education, and elsewhere; and way from civil rights compliance efforts on all levels—toward other priorities. In addition, the 16 Point Program must be reviewed in the context of the Administration's budgetary objectives for FY 1972, 1973, and 1974; its extensive use of impoundment; as well as decisions to both

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

freeze and or reduce federal employment. The statistics included in the Cabinet Committee's Report merely indicates that Hispanic American employment in the total federal work force increased from 2.8% to 3.0%, or a total of 2% from November 1969 to May 1972. This amounts to a total of 2,967 additional increase of Hispanic Americans in the federal work force over a 2½-year period. Whether these are significant gains, that have been promoted under the 16 Point Program, or whether these are logical gains resulting from the affirmative action efforts of the agencies themselves and from a natural increase in applications by Hispanic Americans during the job market squeeze of the last years, is by no means clear. Significant numerical gains were made during the above two year period in the General Schedule Employment area, although the percentage of the total General Schedule levels has increased only from 1.8% to 2.1% for the Spanish-speaking. In short, no dramatic achievements were made in the federal employment area with respect to the Spanish-speaking.

To meet the goals of the Administration, the Cabinet Committee received the Administration's go-ahead on two programs: PROJECT BLUE and PROJECT ALPHA. In the Committee's words, it "assumed an active role in the coordination and implementation of two major projects" (named above). Project Blue was "formulated by the Cabinet Committee staff." Under it, each member department and agency was requested to (1) form an agency-wide committee on Spanish-speaking, (2) set goals and time-tables for increasing Spanish-speaking participation in employment, program deliveries, procurement, and compliance, and (3) submit quarterly reports evaluating agency progress in meeting Spanish-speaking needs "on the basis of parity". Although committees were formed, the 1972 Annual Report of the Cabinet Committee indicates that progress in other areas was both slow and limited.

Project Alpha dealt with needs assessments of (1) Hispanic Americans at various regional and local levels, and (2) the federal response to these needs at these levels. Six federal regions were selected for this effort (Standard Federal Regions II, V, VI, VIII, IV, and IX). Through the joint efforts of OMB and the Cabinet Committee, Regional Council meetings were held in these six regions, involving numerous grant agencies of the federal government. Regions I, III, VII, and X were not involved in the assessment or the regional council efforts, even though substantial numbers of Hispanic Americans live in all of them. No rationale is provided in the 1972 Report for this exclusion of consideration.

The primary foci of the regional "conferences" were on the affirmative action plans for the federal employment of Spanish-speaking; assessment of funding policies at regional levels; and the "informal" involvement of Spanish-speaking "community leaders". To what extent they became, or were, an integral component of the President's 16-Point Program is not clear.

The most significant outcome of these conferences was the finding that there existed little or no useful data on the Spanish-speaking upon which to formulate policies or carry through a policy of parity. The Cabinet Committee's Report states that many agencies compiled no data, and others did so "only sporadically and selectively". The Report adds: "Without a uniform data collection policy and a systematic, analytical process aimed at identifying and overcoming disparities, the reassessment of national goals and priorities is extremely difficult." The absence of such data obviously has a major impact on affirmative action efforts and funding policies on the federal national and regional levels, as they relate to the more than 10 million Hispanic Americans in the country. The impact of this lack of data on state and local levels is, of course, of equal significance. The Cabinet Committee did not, however, address itself to the question of state and local government needs, in spite of the great emphasis on these units of governments by the present Administration. From the FY 1972 Report, there is no indication that the Cabinet Committee made any significant headway into facilitating the creation of a uniform data collection system that would aid in moving policies and program funding decisions toward parity. Thus, the Cabinet Committee's report again omits to address the concerns of state and local government leaders, as well as Spanish-speaking community leaders, who have expressed reservations about the shortcomings of the 1970 Census, which most federal funding agencies are using as the basis for arriving at "parity". This very critical question was apparently not effectively raised by the Cabinet Committee or the "community leaders" who attended the various conferences.

A final critique of the role and effectiveness of the Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-speaking People must wait for the FY 1973 Annual

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Report, which hopefully will be soon available. From the Report for FY 1972, however, it can be seen that the Cabinet Committee was a very weak instrument for the interests of Hispanic Americans. The record prior to July 1972 is clearly a very meager one, as indicated by the size or length of the 1972 Annual Report. The record also shows that the Cabinet Committee was not able to surmount the public information and public relations gap as it pertains to Hispanic Americans. The Report itself does not lend itself to increasing public or Congressional awareness of the plight of the Spanish-speaking peoples in the United States.

THE 15-POINT PROGRAM FOR THE CABINET COMMITTEE ON OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE SPANISH SPEAKING

1. The Chairperson of the Cabinet Committee should be a member of the Domestic Council of the President.

2. The Executive Director of the Cabinet Committee should be subject to Congressional confirmation.

3. The Advisory Committee of the Cabinet Committee should be expanded, to include a cross-section of Spanish-speaking American men and women, from such areas as, health, housing, law, business, labor, youth-development. Its members should be subject to Congressional confirmation. Its powers should be expanded similar to that of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. The first task of this committee should be to deal with the rights and needs of the farm worker and migrant laborers.

4. There should be regional advisory committees or commissions in each federal region, composed of a cross-section of Spanish-speaking American men and women.

5. The Cabinet Committee should be authorized and instructed to hold an annual conference for all Governors' Committees—or Councils—on Opportunities for the Spanish-speaking.

6. The Cabinet Committee should have the authority to hold annual conferences on children, women, and youth, involving a cross-section of Hispanic Americans from throughout the Nation.

7. The Cabinet Committee should be authorized and instructed to review and assess all states' laws directly concerned with the rights and opportunities of the Spanish-speaking.

8. The Cabinet Committee should be delegated with the responsibility for reporting annually on each state's employment efforts for Spanish-speaking men and women, providing data on both state and local government employment.

9. A review of each state's efforts in the area of bilingual education, including the education of migrant worker children, should be instituted by the Cabinet Committee.

10. The Cabinet Committee should be delegated with the authority to review the inadequacies of 1970 Census data, collect complaints, initiate investigations and hold hearings at the local levels, and otherwise facilitate the improvement of demographic data, particularly in those areas where Census data is used for the purpose of allocating funds by federal, state, and local authorities.

11. The Cabinet Committee should be authorized to review the impact of revenue sharing measures, as well as block grant programs, on the Spanish-speaking in each state and the District of Columbia.

12. The Cabinet Committee should be authorized and directed to submit statements on pending legislation and proposals, particularly in areas of education, manpower, health, housing, immigration laws, civil rights, and other major areas affecting consumers, to show how the Spanish-speaking benefit or can benefit.

13. The Cabinet Committee should be directed to submit statements on all matters relating to the District of Columbia, to insure consideration of the interests and needs of the Spanish-speaking in the Washington area.

14. The Cabinet Committee should undertake national sample surveys on an annual basis, to discern the needs of the Spanish-speaking in areas of health, education, employment, housing, and other areas. The results of these surveys should be made public.

15. There should be an extensive and detailed annual state of affairs report on Hispanic Americans, including reports on the surveys, conferences, regional committees' efforts, studies of all federal agency efforts on what they are doing for the Spanish-speaking, and including a review of employment, training, and other

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

opportunities by these agencies, as well as grants and contracts awarded to Spanish-speaking firms, and other grants and contracts awarded to firms dealing specifically with Spanish-speaking.

16. The Cabinet Committee should be composed of members who have the time to work on the concerns of the Committee. To that end, the Department Secretaries should delegate Assistant- or Under-Secretaries as members of the Committee. All members of the Cabinet Committee should be explicitly prohibited from participating in partisan political activities.

Mr. EDWARDS. Cheryl Keyser was unable to be here.

Ms. FRANKEL. I have her statement.

Mr. EDWARDS. Fine.

Ms. Frankel will present the statement of Ms. Keyser for Mujeres En Accion.

Ms. FRANKEL. I do hope that the second time around is infinitely easier than the first.

Mr. EDWARDS. Very well.

Ms. FRANKEL. I am a member of this organization also.

TESTIMONY OF CHERYL KEYSER, MUJERES EN ACCION, PRESENTED BY RAQUEL FRANKEL

Ms. FRANKEL. This is a statement from Mujeres En Accion in regard to the Cabinet Committee for Opportunities for the Spanish-Speaking, July 19, 1973, presented by Cheryl Maria Keyser:

"Buenos dias a usted senor Presidente y a los otros distinguidos senores, miembros de este Comite. Les agradezco mucho esta oportunidad de expresar mis inquietudes sobre el papel del Comite del Gabinete sobre oportunidades para la gente de habla espanola."

If my words sound strange to you, I hope this "strangeness" will not continue. For the Spanish speaking or "el Latino" forms the second-largest minority group in these United States, and the United States itself is the fifth-largest Spanish-speaking country in the world.

Census Bureau estimates based on a nationwide survey of about 47,000 Spanish-speaking households conducted in March 1972, establish that there are 9.2 million Latinos, including 5.3 million persons of Central and South American origin.

However, the U.S. Latino still remains a hard to identify sector of the population that has been politically manipulated and exploited by unfulfilled promises.

The Cabinet Committee's press release dated June 21 lists an impressive number of projects on behalf of the U.S. Latino that have been undertaken in fiscal year 1973. Yet in a press conference less than a month later, on July 18, 1973, the Chairman tells us that this kind of work will no longer be done. He further informs us that his staff does not have the human resources to take care of the needs of the Spanish-speaking people in this country. So what will happen is that certain areas will be lopped off of the Committee's work "such as possibly, the elderly, youth, law enforcement, drug abuse, and a few others."

Instead, the Committee will concentrate on employment and the "collection of recipient-beneficiary data by ethnicity."

What does this mean?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Employment according to the Cabinet Committee, although encompassing both the public and private sectors, basically centers around the Federal Government. This can be verified by even a cursory view of their annual reports and previous congressional testimony. Even narrower, it bases its record on its efforts of concentrating its activities in a large part on the 16-point program, created by President Nixon in November 1970 to assist the Latino in securing an equitable share of jobs in the Federal Government. This practice for the Latino, has had a dismal record of failure throughout a 20-year period under four Presidents.

In the implementation of the 16-point program we have noted certain inconsistencies in the Cabinet Committee's assessment of its effectiveness.

In March 1972, Chairman Ramirez testified to the Civil Rights Oversight Subcommittee that:

> The Cabinet Committee doesn't feel there has been substantial progress in overcoming the employment problems of the Spanish speaking (under the Sixteen-Point Program).

Prior to the election in November 1972, Mr. Ramirez recorded a Spanish speaking disc which was sent to all Spanish language radio stations stating:

> As is already well known, a great many of the activities of the Cabinet Committee are based on President Nixon's Sixteen-Point Program for Spanish surnamed Americans who are interested in entering the Federal Government. Special emphasis is given to Point Thirteen (upward mobility programs). . . . Its implementation has resulted in a substantial increase in Spanish surnamed employees in the Federal Government.

However, in hearings held only last week, July 11, 1973, by this subcommittee, Chairman Edwards pointed out that only a "0.1 percent better record" had been obtained last year in the Latino Federal employment over the previous years.

We respectfully ask if this 0.1 percent is that "substantial increase" that is mentioned in the Cabinet Committee's disc? If so, then we must agree with Mr. Ramirez that:

> Anyone claiming success in bringing full opportunity to Spanish-speaking people in our government today, whether it be legislative, judicial or executive, . . . would just have to have his head examined.

Yet, there is where Mr. Ramirez proposes to dedicate Cabinet Committee activities.

Similarly, the data collection process which Mr. Ramirez also wishes to develop in the Cabinet Committee seems to us to be a duplication of effort. For example, if the Cabinet Committee wants enrollment figures for Latinos in U.S. medical colleges, we suggest that they contact the Association of American Medical Colleges located in Washington, D.C., which has already tabulated this information. We know of other sources of a like nature who also have this type of information readily available for the asking.

Mr. Chairman, we feel that the Cabinet Committee's talent and resources can be put to better use. We would like to recommend that present legislation be reconsidered to redefine the policymaking base and restructure the present Cabinet Committee, that specific, measurable goals be drawn up, a time limitation be established, and an adequate budget be provided to enable such a body to:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(a) Collate and analyze existing recommendations as to ways to assist the Latino;

(b) Develop priority fields of action, timetables, and guidelines for implementation of the recommendations (a);

(c) Develop a mechanism to implement, monitor, and evaluate these recommendations. Above all, this mechanism must have channels for accessibility by the Latinos which are guaranteed by law, to insure that the wishes and needs of this population are fully taken into account.

A restructured body must reflect a level of stature, commitment, and expertise that is beyond the influence of partisan politics. It must express the kind of accountability to the Latino population which has been demonstrated by such highly respected Latino leaders as Dr. Edward Casavantes of New Mexico, Dr. Cleofas Calleros of El Paso, Tex., Dr. Julian Samora of Notre Dame, Ind., Dr. Ernesto Galarza of California, and others of like caliber.

Therefore, we propose that this restructured body be composed of individuals who equally represent the views of the legislative and executive branches of government and the organizationally elected leadership of the Latino population to insure a broad base of accountability by the Cabinet Committee to the Latinos it speaks for.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, Mujeres en Accion fully supports the other organizations and individuals who are expressing their concern about the ineffectiveness and lack of response demonstrated by the Cabinet Committee.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Hilda Hidalgo follows:]

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY,
LIVINGSTON COLLEGE,
New Brunswick, N.J., July 24, 1973.

Representative DON EDWARDS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights, Committee on the Judiciary, Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE EDWARDS: Since I was unable to appear at the hearing on July 19, 1973, I am enclosing my statement.

Sincerely,

DR. HILDA HIDALGO.

[Enclosures.]

STATEMENT FROM DR. HILDA HIDALGO TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JULY 24, 1973

I was appointed by President Nixon to serve on the first advisory council to the Cabinet Committee for Equal Opportunity for Spanish Speaking Americans.

When I arrived at the offices of the Cabinet Committee for Equal Opportunity for Spanish Speaking Americans on August 5, 1971, Mr. Edgardo Buttari and Mr. Manuel Gilberga, two of the newly appointed members of the advisory council, were talking about what they thought was their major purpose and goal: the re-election of Richard Nixon. This conversation took place before the meeting was called to order. It was my impression that they thought I was a "secretary" since they disregarded my presence and only responded to my good morning greeting with a nod. Another member (I cannot recall his name) came and the three continued to discuss what they understood to be the whole purpose of the committee and the advisory council: the re-election of the President. I felt great discomfort since it was clear to me that I would not work for the re-election of Mr. Nixon, and I thought the purpose of the council was stated in Public Law 91-181.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

When Mr. Ramirez entered the room I asked for immediate clarification, stating that all members present had entered the room with some kind of statement indicating their commitment, admiration and desire to work for and serve the President and I, on my part, did not share these sentiments and wanted to work exclusively for the benefit of Spanish Speaking Americans, especially the Puerto Ricans. Mr. Ramirez' face got red and he explained that the cabinet committee will obey the law, however it was evident to him that President Nixon was the best friend of the Spanish Speaking Committee.

While in my presence the "right" things were said; it became evident to me that the Cabinet Committee was being used by Mr. Ramirez and the President for political purposes. The following events prompted the above conclusion:

1. While the Public Law 91-181 indicated that the Cabinet Committee was to exclude Puerto Ricans from the island of Puerto Rico (see exhibit #1), the chairman of the Advisory Group was Mr. Jorge Tristani, a very wealthy island-based Republican, son-in-law of Senator Chanez and close associate of the then governor of Puerto Rico, Luis Ferré.

2. The vice chairman, Mr. Manuel Gilberga, is a strong supporter of President Nixon, campaigned publicly for him, and was at the time of his appointment chairman of the "nationalities" or "ethnic" committee for the national Republican party.

3. I was called to only two meetings and systematically excluded from participation in the Committee for my honest expression of opposition to President Nixon. While I knew that activities were held by the Committee in New York, I was never notified or informed.

4. The request of the Advisory Council to receive a monthly report was never implemented (see minutes of Advisory Council August 5, 1971). Instead there was a Newsletter that, to my judgment, amounted to a public relation boost to Mr. Ramirez in preparation to his active participation in the campaign to re-elect the President.

5. Other members of the Advisory Council began to be dissatisfied with Mr. Ramirez' leadership (see Mr. Tristani's letter of March 20, 1972). Mr. Ramirez traveled a lot and seemed to be one of the chief spokesmen of partisan, presidential propaganda in the country.

6. When the New York Times published the so-called "Spanish political strategy of the Nixon administration", I telephoned Mr. Ramirez and he personally indicated to me that, while he had requested the study, "he just filed it and paid no attention to it". I was indignant at the lack of respect, sensitivity and integrity demonstrated by Mr. Ramirez. I also knew that in spite of Mr. Ramirez' protestation, the "strategy" had been implemented in N. v York and New Jersey (see Cuban American Committee for Republican Party letter of October 5, 1971).

I resigned publicly from the Advisory Committee because of my belief that the administration acted in bad faith when it appointed me to serve on the Advisory Council by misrepresenting the actual use the administration intended of the Advisory Council and The Cabinet Committee. In my judgment, Mr. Ramirez' main function was to be front man for the "Spanish political strategy of the Nixon administration." (See letter of resignation).

EXHIBIT 1

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., December 8, 1971.

Reply to attention of Acting Assistant General Counsel—LR Records and Administration Division.

Subject: Legal Questions.

PETER PATNO,
Administrative Officer, Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for Spanish-Speaking People (the Committee):

Pursuant to your request, we offer the following opinions on certain legal questions which you and Miss Calvan have presented to this office.

1. In performing its functions, should the Committee take into account for statistical and other purposes those persons who live on the island of Puerto Rico?

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A careful review of the legislative history of the Act establishing the Committee reveals that it was not the intent of Congress to extend jurisdiction of the Committee over persons who live on the island of Puerto Rico. The language of the Act itself is revealing in this regard: "It is the purpose of this Act to assure that Federal programs are reaching all Mexican Americans, *Puerto Rican Americans*, Cuban Americans, and all other Spanish-speaking and Spanish-surnamed Americans . . . ." (P.L. 91-181, 83 Stat. 838) [Emphasis added.] The use of the term "Puerto Rican Americans" suggests a limited number of persons with Puerto Rican backgrounds, rather than the more common denotation "Puerto Ricans" which is suggestive of all persons of Puerto Rican background. The legislative history provides even more conclusive evidence:

(a) in outlining the areas of the country where most of the population affected by the legislation resides, Senator Montoya, who introduced the bill in the Senate, stated that the Puerto Ricans who would receive the benefits of the Committee reside primarily in New York (*Hearings on S. 720 Before the Subcomm. on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Comm. on Government Operations*, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., at 28 (1969));

(b) Senator Montoya, commenting on the criticism that the predecessor Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs had failed to meet the needs of all Spanish-speaking Americans, proposed that the Act contain specific language including ". . . Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and all other Spanish-speaking or Spanish-surnamed Americans *residing in the several States and the District of Columbia*." (*Senate Hearings, supra*, at 78) [Emphasis added.];

(c) in comments made at the time of the creation of the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs, President Johnson stated that the purpose of the Committee was "to help meet the pressing needs of . . . the Mexican-Americans of the Southwest, *the Puerto Ricans in the mainland*, the Cubans and others." (*Senate Hearings, supra*, at 80) [Emphasis added.];

(d) the entire set of statistics that made up Exhibit 7 of the *Senate Hearings, supra*, was entitled, "Focus on Problems Faced by Mainland Puerto Ricans"; moreover, none of the vast amount of statistical evidence brought before the House or Senate hearings contained information dealing with the problems of Puerto Ricans on the island; and

(e) in the statement dealing with Puerto Rican problems made by Manuel Diaz, Jr., he emphasized that the purpose of the Committee would be "to coordinate the delivery of services to the Spanish-speaking peoples of the United States." (*Senate Hearings, supra*, at 263.)

Clearly, the term "Puerto Rican American" in P.L. 91-181 refers only to those persons of Puerto Rican background who now reside in one of the fifty states or the District of Columbia.

2. *What is the status of the Advisory Council and for what activities may it expend monies appropriated to the Committee by Congress?*

The Act creating the Committee and the legislative history hereof are woefully lacking in clarity in many areas, but no section is as ambiguous as Section 7 establishing the Advisory Council. Only one thing is certain from the legislative history: the Council was established because of the concern of numerous witnesses that the Committee itself could not in its statutory makeup be responsive to all of the factions which together constitute the applicable Spanish-speaking peoples (S. Rep. No. 422, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. 5 (1969)). Furthermore, the Act itself requires that the members of the Advisory Council be appointed by the President, and that the purpose of the Council be "to advise the Committee with respect to such matters as the Chairman of the Committee may request."

From these provisions we can determine that the Council is not a subpart of the Committee, but indeed retains some degree of autonomy. However, despite its independent composition, its functions are inextricably bound to the needs of the Committee. Therefore, the Congress has not seen fit to grant the Council its own appropriation, but instead forces it to rely upon the monies appropriated to the Committee. For what purposes may the Council expend these monies on its own initiative? The Act itself succinctly states that in fulfilling its function of advising the Committee on matters which the Chairman of the Committee has referred to it, the Council has the independent authority to appoint and fix the compensation of necessary personnel and to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with 5 U.S.C. 3109. Because this section of the Code refers to the contracting of these services, in the area of obtaining "experts or consultants or an organization thereof," the Council has some independent contracting authority (5 U.S.C. 3109(b)).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It is the opinion of this office that the Council's independent contracting authority ends there. Although the Comptroller General has often held that the lack of explicit contracting authority does not necessarily prohibit an agency from entering into contracts when appropriated funds are available, the fact that the functions of the Council flow from the requests of the Committee, that other necessary contracting may be accomplished through the auspices of the Committee, and that the Council has no independent appropriation of its own dictates that the contracting authority of the Council be limited to those areas provided by statute.

3. Do the functions of the Committee extend to providing services to those Spanish-speaking aliens who are legally in the United States?

The functions of the Committee definitely extend to providing its services both to Spanish-speaking citizens of the United States as well as Spanish-speaking aliens who are legally in the United States. 42 U.S.C. 1981 provides in pertinent part: "All persons within the jurisdiction of the United States shall have the same right . . . to the full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings . . . ."

On numerous occasions the Supreme Court of the United States and the lower Federal courts have held that this provision of law applies not only to citizens of the United States, but also to legally-entered aliens (see, e.g., *Takashi* v. *Fish & Game Commission*, 334 U.S. 410 (1948); *Eisler* v. *United States*, 170 F.2d 273 (D.C. Cir. 1948)). The only exceptions to extending the benefits of the laws of the United States to legally-entered aliens are those laws dealing with the privileges of citizenship, e.g., voting.

To further support the contention that the benefits of P.L. 91-181 extend to aliens as well as citizens, one need only look at the statistics compiled by various proponents of S. 740. Despite the extensive categorical breakdown of Spanish-speaking people in the United States, no attempt was made by any of the witnesses to differentiate between citizens and aliens (*Senate Hearings, supra*). Therefore, both the general and the specific law are clearly indicative of the fact that the services of the Committee extend to legally-entered Spanish-speaking aliens as well as to citizens of this country.

4. What persons may make congressional contacts as official representatives of the Committee?

The decision as to who shall act as spokesman for the Committee before the Congress is an administrative one, rather than legal. It is certainly reasonable, and in accord with the practices of numerous other agencies, to limit those persons who may make contact with the Congress *on behalf of the Committee* to the Chairman and a duly appointed Congressional Liaison Officer.

However, officials of the Committee should take care to avoid interfering with the civil right of a Committee employee to make congressional contacts *on a personal basis*. Admittedly, there may be certain occasions when an employee's conduct in conflicting the Congress appears to fly in the face of the Committee's purposes, goals and activities. Nevertheless, it would be patently unwise to take an adverse action against an employee based solely on these contacts. A concrete misprison of duty is necessary before disciplinary action is warranted.

It should be noted that the quasi-autonomy of the Advisory Council discussed above would permit the Council the capacity to select its own official congressional liaison. Disputes which may arise between the Committee and the Council which result from congressional contact may be unfortunate, but they are legally inescapable.

5. What is the literary property status of speeches and articles prepared in their official capacity by former employees of the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican American Affairs?

All works which are prepared by an official or employee of the Federal Government while acting in his official capacity are deemed to be in the public domain, and are precluded from receiving the protection of statutory copyright or common law literary property (17 U.S.C. 8). Therefore, those materials which were prepared and published [illegible] auspices of the Inter-Agency Committee on Mexican Affairs are in the public domain, and may be reprinted in whole or in part by any person with or without the permission of the author or the Committee. However, any person who reprints such material from the original text is in like manner prohibited from obtaining any literary property interest therein.

DAVID C. FISHER, JR.,
Acting Assistant General Counsel,
Records and Administration Division.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[From the San Juan Star, Thursday, Nov. 9, 1972]

PUERTO RICAN QUITS COUNCIL TO PRESIDENT

One of the three Puerto Rican members of President Nixon's advisory council to the Cabinet Committee on Opportunity to Spanish-Americans has announced her resignation.

Hilda Hidalgo, a resident of Newark, N.J., accused the chairman of the council, Henry Ramirez, of using his office simply to promote the President's re-election campaign among Spanish-speaking Americans.

She said she made her resignation public "because this administration acted in bad faith when it appointed me and two other Puerto Ricans to serve in the advisory council."

She said Ramirez used his position to promote the "Spanish political strategy of the Nixon administration."

SAN JUAN, P.R., *March 20, 1972.*

MR. HENRY RAMIREZ,
Chairman, Cabinet Committee on Opportunity for the Spanish Speaking, Washington, D.C.

DEAR HENRY: You may recall that there was a meeting of the Advisory Council scheduled for 28th February. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the agenda of your forthcoming meeting of the Cabinet Committee. This Advisory Council meeting was cancelled at your request and tentatively rescheduled for March 13th. The new date was apparently not feasible either as I had no further communication from you on it and I discovered on Sunday 12 March, upon calling you in Washington, that you were in California, on an extended trip.

Frankly, I am disappointed, on the role of the Advisory Council. If we are to properly render some judicious advice we have to be kept abreast of all developments, including accomplishments as well as failures and frustrations. To date I have not received the minutes of our last meeting or any official information concerning the activities of the Staff since.

I am going to Europe via New York next Friday the 24th and shall not return for approximately four weeks. I feel, however, that a meeting of the council is overdue and would like to convoke one for the end of April. This would give you sufficient time to mail each of us a memo concerning the latest developments as well as the matters on which you would want our advice during our next session.

Please let me hear from you at once as I am leaving Friday next.

Sincerely yours,

JORGE E. TRISTANI,
Chairman, Advisory Council.

DECEMBER 28, 1972.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, United States of America,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NIXON: I am presenting my resignation to the Advisory Council to the Cabinet Committee on Equal Opportunity for the Spanish Speaking People. I must express my extreme disappointment at the way the committee was misused. The Advisory Council met only two times up until now and its function was to rubber stamp political decisionmaking and the chairman of the committee did not take into account the real well being of the Spanish citizens of this country, especially the Puerto Ricans. During the last six months the Cabinet Committee seems to have been solely a political instrument of the administration. This is contrary to the purpose of the committee as outlined by the act of Congress, who created the committee in the first place.

Since you have been reelected I hope that there will be no need to continue to use the cabinet committee for political purposes and maybe the next four years could be productive in terms of acquiring equal opportunity for Spanish speaking Americans.

Sincerely,

HILDA HIDALGO.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CUBAN-AMERICAN COMMITTEE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY,
Elizabeth, N.J., October 5, 1971.

DRA. HILDA A. HIDALGO,
Urban Studies & Community Development,
Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

DISTINGUIDA DOCTORA HIDALGO: Correspondiendo a los acuerdos adoptados en la reunión celebrada en la ciudad de Elizabeth NJ en Agosto 15 del presente año, trabajamos en la organización del CONGRESO NACIONAL DE CIUDADANOS AMERICANOS de habla española, que esperamos poder celebrar en Washington DC en el mes de Abril del entrante año 1972.

Nuestro propósito responde fundamentalmente a la idea de prestar todo el calor y apoyo a la reelección como Presidente de los Estados Unidos, del Honorable Richard M. Nixon, en las elecciones señaladas para Noviembre de 1972.

Igualmente, es objetivo central de este movimiento destacar la importancia del esfuerzo cívico-electoral que realiza mos con absoluta independencia de factores agenos a los intereses e idio sincrasia de nuestro grupeo étnico.

La lucha electoral que se avecina será dehonda significación nacional como consecuencia de los factores que estarán presente en la misma. No se trata de una simple contienda tradicional de Demócratas y Republicanos. Los Estados Unidos están colocados en la encrucijada dramática de hacerle frente, en cualesquier frente, a la conspiración comunista internacional que ha logrado infiltrarse en los centros más sensibles de la vida americana. El carburante ideológico aportado por el aparato de difamación y propaganda del comunismo, será factor de nosiva influencia para agitar todos los movimientos originados como consecuencia de los proximos comicios, dentro y fuera de los propios partidos nacionales.

La movilizacion de la población hispana de los Estados Unidos, que suma en la actualidad 11.818.965 habitantes, — constituye un objetivo immediato de los que pretenden dividir la Nación en campos antagónicos alentando motivos raciales con el pretexto de la defensa de los grupos minoritarios.

Una Coalición "Boricua-Chicana", en oposición al Presidente Nixon y al Gobierno de los Estados Unidos, está siendo organizado por elementos izquierdistas, con el apoyo del Congresista Hernan Madillo, de New York, el Senador Joseph Montoya, de Nuevo Mexico y los tambien congresistas Edward Rayball y Manuel Lujar de California y Nuevo Mexico, respectivamente.

Frente a esta maniobra, de oscuros designios, tenemos la obligación de organizarnos igualmente, los representativos de la población his pana que hemos tomado conciencia de vuestro verdadero destino y responsabilidad historica y que no podemos convertirnos en instrumento de la demagogia y el engaño.

Nosotros veriamos como gusto vuestra adhesión al Congreso y su activa cooperación en el estado de New Jersey, donde reside.

Asimismo, apreciamos el envio de iniciativas que formarian parte de los asuntos objeto de consideración en la Agenda del Congreso.

Aprovechamos la oportunidad para saludarle muy cordialmente y para ofrecerle el testimonio de nuestra más alta considercaión personal.

De Ud. atentamente.

POR LA COMISION ORGANIZADORA,
DR. RAUL COMESANAS, *Presidente.*
DR. GILBERTO COMPA, *Secretario.*

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you very much, Ms. Frankel.

I am pleased that all of the witnesses this morning are being most affirmative in their testimony, not underemphasizing the problems, that certainly this committee, at least partially feel—the history and accomplishments or lack of accomplishments of the Cabinet Committee, but at the same time, I think, all the witnesses are unanimous in feeling that we should try to help the committee to do a better job in actually doing what we can to require that the Cabinet Committee do a better job.

One of the problems has been, of course, that the law is written rather specifically and requires certain things that have to be done, and the Cabinet Committee has not complied with the intent of Congress.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There was much discussion about accountability—and very creatively I thought—from all four witnesses; accountability not only to the Latin-speaking population of the United States but also accountability to the Government, to the people of the United States generally, by the committee with regard to the committee's responsibility.

If the committee had, for example, four meetings a year with the committee itself, the members of the committee in attendance and reporting to the Cabinet Committee about the accomplishments or aims and goals, shall we say, of the Department of Agriculture, by the Secretary of Agriculture, and by the Secretary of Commerce with regard to the and by the Secretary of Commerce and Department and fair employment promotion and all the small business in all the small areas where the Department of Commerce is involved and the same for the Secretary of Labor, HEW, and so forth, and which this information, put into the annual report.

The annual report that was presented to the committee last week was silent and most subjects, a very short cursory report.

I wonder if anyone would care to comment on a little more on accountability—those two aspects of accountability, not only to the Spanish-speaking people of the United States but the accountability in requiring the job to be done as contemplated in the legislation.

Mr. ZERMENO. Let me just comment on that.

The legislation was as general and as broad as you can make it. If you want something not to be effective—it does require, in your report, it does require those things.

But the function of the committee is designed to be advisory to Departments and Agencies and there is really no way that—it is like an in-house advisory body instead of the administrative structure and that, in terms of reporting on accountability we cannot measure.

You know, how do you measure the effects of the advice of a Cabinet Committee to HUD or DOL or whoever it is?

Our concern is that the functions of the committee described in the legislation are not accountable. You cannot hold anyone accountable for it. You have to really get to the point of defining functions in such a way that we can get at minimum data that gives the Cabinet Committee the authority to go within a department and ask and request and get data needed.

There is no way by the committee's report itself that they can figure what service the Spanish-speaking community is getting by the Federal Agency. I am saying that the function describing the legislation is strictly advisory to the Departments and Agencies.

How do you measure that?

Ms. FRANKEL. May I add something, and that is, I, as a Spanish-speaking person, also feel that the accountability goes to the various Cabinet offices, and to what use they have made of the Spanish-speaking community.

We feel that there is accountability on their part to us as well.

Mr. EDWARDS. Well, it would seem to me that Congress very specifically set up an organization, a Cabinet Committee that can at least ask for an accountability from the various Cabinet officers at the highest level, and that at least there would be a large step if it were pursue it.

I do not think that it would have been possible at that time at least to create a Cabinet Committee with great powers.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. ZERMENO. At least some specific task that can be measured.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Wiggins.

Mr. WIGGINS. I would like to pursue this, Mr. Chairman, because it is a central part of this testimony. "Accountability should be provided by the activities of the Cabinet Committee."

It is not clear just exactly what you mean.

I am going to suggest what you might mean, but, certainly, tell me if I have suggested incorrectly.

Do you mean that the legislation should be drafted to compel the various component parts of the Cabinet Committee, the agencies of Government, to report to the Cabinet Committee on their effectiveness in integrating Spanish-speaking people into their programs? Is that what you mean?

Mr. ZERMENO. That would be one. I am sure there are others that could come up, but that certainly would be one, yes.

Mr. WIGGINS. Would anyone wish to expand on the meaning of accountability as used in your various statements?

Mr. VASQUEZ. I think accountability, sir, to us, means that for the first time the Cabinet Committee begins to see, to go out and look at the problems in our barrios.

When we talk about accountability, we look at a Cabinet Committee that has been there since 1969. I think that the advisory committee to the Cabinet Committee has to be expanded.

Second, there are many States with a large Spanish-speaking population that have Governors on committees on the Spanish-speaking, but these should be put together to bring in more information, more data on the Spanish speaking to reinforce their position within those departments.

Mr. WIGGINS. As you phrase it, accountability is really the communication which should exist between the Cabinet Committee itself and those it seeks to serve.

I suppose that is the proper definition of accountability, but is that your focus when you speak of accountability as a statute that should require the Cabinet Committee to seek out the views of those it seeks to represent?

Mr. VASQUEZ. Yes, sir.

Ms. FRANKEL. Well, for me, if I may interject here, accountability is also responsive. It is not purely communication but it is the responsibility of actually addressing issues which the Advisory Committee presents to the Cabinet Committee as being vital issues, which they must face, and then accountability should effect the committee's efforts and the Cabinet, their efforts to address and help solve these problems.

Mr. WIGGINS. I see.

Mr. ZERMENO. If I may add something to that. We are concerned that there is no way to measure what the committee is doing or not doing or what effect it is having to provide services, or opportunities to the Spanish speaking, primarily because we never know what the role of the committee is, what it set out in this fiscal year to be the very specific task, is it publicized in such a way that the community can come back 6 months or a year later and did they or did they not accomplish something? To say that we are going on a tour of the regional offices and attempt to identify the needs and responsiveness

BEST COPY AVAILABLE BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of government is not measurable unless you want to measure the fact that they took trips and had these trips, but if there is no reporting on what the need is, what the distribution to these areas was, what the input of community people is that they met with there is no way to measure.

I mean, it is difficult to measure how I give you advice and what happened with that.

Mr. WIGGINS. Well, I think, that your definition of accountability is more consistent with the commonly understood meaning of the word.

Perhaps, it would be possible to require by statute that the Cabinet Committee set out certain annual goals that it seeks to achieve. Then in its annual report at the end of the year address itself to what is being done to achieve those goals so that you can measure what is has done within the year to accomplish the objectives that it set for itself. It would be something that I could read and you could read and better understand the efforts of the committee.

That would require some draftsmanship. The present statute does not require that.

I suspect that one of the great problems of the Cabinet Committee is that your expectations of it have far exceeded the statutory authority within which it is being operated and funded; $900,000 funding looks like a great deal, but in terms of achieving the objectives which we hope to be achieved, it is grossly inadequate.

The committee is operating under a clear restraint in that regard. To some extent its lack of performance has to be understood with reference to the financial restraints placed upon it.

I have no further questions.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Rangel. Yes; I need some help as to why people think it is so important that the Commission and the Cabinet meet with the committee four times a year and issue an annual report, because I share your concerns but I think it was very honest of Mr. Ramirez to admit that he has not been able to call a meeting, but even if he had called a meeting, I do not know whether the best interests of the Spanish-speaking people would have come out of it.

It seems to me that no matter how restricted the budget is, if the nature of the U.S. Government is to provide services for its cities, that we do have Federal agencies in every community that are supposed to be committed to delivering these services.

I do not see how it would cost any more within this $900,000 budget for every Spanish-speaking person to know that within that agency there is somebody that has some communication allegedly with the Cabinet. I do not know how it relates to Spanish-speaking communities throughout the country, but representing East Harlem, they would have a very difficult time getting some input with this Cabinet meeting, whether they met every day or every week or four times a year.

But, we do have Federal buildings that are geared to deliver services to the poor and others, and it seems to me—and it was said and threaded throughout the testimony—that if there were regional offices established within the existing Federal buildings, that this might allow the Cabinet an opportunity to truly test the needs of the people that they allegedly have sworn to serve, and at the same time would allow some type of accountability, not necessarily in an annual report but in a

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

periodic report to that particular community as to what they were able or not able to achieve based upon what was demanded.

It seems to me that should mean a heck of a lot more to people than whether or not the Cabinet meets and the Cabinet should meet when they find that on the regional level those in charge have not delivered that service.

Would anyone care to comment on that?

Mr. Zermeno. Yes; I would like to comment on that.

Our concern for the meetings of the Cabinet Committee is a measure of the intent of the Cabinet to actually implement what the legislation says. If they do not meet, right off tells me that they do not really care.

If anything, I do not expect anything great to come out of it, but it is a sign of commitment of these agencies, if they do not even show up for meetings, what else are they going to do?

Mr. Rangel. Would you not be able to test that commitment more accurately through local organizations——

Mr. Zermeno. Yes.

Mr. Rangel. [continuing]. Rather than by Mr. Ramirez stopping by and giving a speech and moving on to another town?

Mr. Zermeno. Yes; I was getting to that.

Mr. Rangel. There are agencies in every community that are allegedly supposed to provide the very same services that you are demanding for these Spanish-speaking people.

Mr. Zermeno. That is correct.

Most of the staff of Spanish-speaking offices of Spanish-speaking concerns within an agency are limited very much by its bureaucratic structure and all of the restrictions that go with it.

I think that what we are seeing in the regional processes which I am sure will be enforced now with some form of the revenue-sharing count-down, there is whole structuring of regional councils.

There has been some discussion in some circles that possibly there should be a Cabinet Committee staff dealing at the regional level with regional councils, which are coordinating bodies of the Federal agencies, in those regions.

Now, that is one possibility that has been thrown out, but I do agree with you that it has to reach home.

Mr. Rangel. Well, what do you think about the concept that was being knocked around that you do have Cabinet representaton on the regional level?

Mr. Zermeno. It is fine if they have from Washington or someone in Washington that they can play a role.

Mr. Rangel. Well, if you can create this committee and say that they are meeting with very important people four times a year, you have to assume that they very least they should be able to do is play a role.

Now, I am assuming that, or the whole thing is just a farce.

Ms. Frankel. May I interject something?

I think that I understand your concerns. I would simply like to respond to what I see as one of your concerns, and that is that I think we are talking about two different kinds of needs.

You keep talking about services, and I think there is also here a psychological response that we need in knowing that they have com-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

plied with the law, that they have met, that they are being responsive to the obligation that has been assigned to them, that I think this inability of the Latino that he really and truly and faithfully is being represented in Washington and is almost as deep a need to be served as some of the services that we are talking about.

I think maybe at this level that we are frustrated with possibly the lack of sense of mission that we have seen.

Mr. RANGEL. Would you not feel more frustrated if you knew that they were meeting and not anything was coming out of it?

Ms. FEYNKEL. Then we would have a basis for mobilization.

Mr. RANGEL. I think that you have that now.

From the testimony I heard a couple of weeks ago, I do not think that you need any more to mobilize. It seems to me that there is absolutely no substitute for people to be involved in Government to such an extent that they do not have to ask anybody for anything and make certain that if the Government does not work for the people that they have been elected to serve, then it should not effectively work for anybody.

Until we can reach that point, it seems to me that we have to get close to those who are in the Government payroll to see that they are producing for all the people that they should. So I am not going to support the Cabinet violating the law by not meeting, but I can assure you that in East Harlem, they do not need any psychological benefits.

What they need to have is interpreted in terms of bread and butter, and soon.

I am inviting the entire Cabinet to East Harlem, and I am certain that the community will not be responding in psychological terms, and I hope they will be able to show what they intend to do and who they can identify after they leave the community as to who the leaders can meet with and try to work out effective programs.

I have no further questions.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. McClory?

Mr. MCCLORY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am sorry that I have not been able to be here to hear the testimony of all the witnesses.

I want to assure the witnesses that I will examine their statements. I want to also emphasize that all the Spanish-speaking communities are not located on the west coast or in East Harlem. We have a large community in Waukegan, Ill.

I am proud that in my district we have had for the last 2 or 3 years, hosted the annual convention of the GI Forum of the State of Illinois.

I am conscious of the shortcomings of the committee created by the President and also the inability to fully implement the 16-point program, which was so highly commendable. On the other hand, I want to emphasize that through the self-help programs and the regional programs and the assistance of the regional councils that function in Illinois. We have had substantial contributions during the recent years with regard to language studies.

We have a number of specially financed language programs throughout my congressional district. We also have migrant workers programs. We have a center for the Spanish-speaking community. We

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

did not have that a couple of years ago, so that notwithstanding all the failures to meet the goals, it seems to me that we should recognize the advances that have resulted from cooperative effort at the Federal, State, and local levels and not to despair entirely or to condemn completely.

So, I am hopeful that these hearings can not only point at criticism, but also can result in constructive change so that we do not abandon this committee. So that we do not abandon any of the goals that we have set, but we try to implement them.

We may have failed so far, but let us keep trying. Let us try to assure that all Americans, regardless of their racial or ethnic language background, can arrive at full citizenship.

I feel very strongly that the family and home influence that is centered in the Spanish-speaking homes should be a source of great inspiration for all Americans. It contributes to a high level of learning and of spiritual and of ethical conduct.

I have had many, many opportunities to recognize this and to observe this, so I commend the overall members of the Spanish-speaking community and want to insure them of my interest in promoting their welfare.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you, very much.

Mr. RANGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCLORY. Yes.

Mr. RANGEL. Could you tell me whether or not the Cabinet Committee has been able to assist you in obtaining these successes in your area, because it may give us all some guidelines as to how we can work a little more closely with them?

Mr. MCCLORY. I am not aware of such specifics although as Ms. Frankel has said, I think the Committee certainly has been a source of psychological advantage, and I believe, too, that the regional council has benefited from the output of the Committee.

Mr. RANGEL. Thank you.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Manuel Fierro is also here with the Southwest Council.

TESTIMONY OF MANUEL FIERRO, PRESIDENT AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, RAZA ASSOCIATION OF SPANISH SURNAMED AMERICANS (RASSA)

Mr. FIERRO. I am with the Association of Spanish Surnamed Americans.

Mr. EDWARDS. Oh, yes. Would you identify yourself and your organization.

Mr. FIERRO. My name is Manuel Fierro and I am the president and executive director of Raza Association of Spanish Surnamed Americans, which is a national nonpartisan citizen's lobby for Spanish speaking peopl here in Washington, D.C.

I would like, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, to make a few remarks.

I do not have a prepared statement but we will have a prepared statement for the Government Operations Committee when it convenes next Monday.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

I do want to make some corrections and clear some misconceptions that have been thrown around here.

First of all, it is our impression that there is no Cabinet Committee whatsoever, because we are talking about two separate bodies, about a Cabinet Committee that represents secretaries of various Cabinets that have never met—they met for the first time yesterday, and we are talking about another office that is headed by Mr. Ramirez, and we are talking about two separate issues: one, of the Cabinet itself and one is the office that is headed by Mr. Ramirez.

I have the impression—and I have the impression from this testimony that has been provided—that there is no Cabinet at all. There is an office with staff that has been delegated responsibilities to some degree of the advocacy of the Spanish-speaking people, but in essence, the Cabinet Committee has not had input to a great extent.

By the same token, Mr. Ramirez mentioned the last time, Mr. Chairman, that there is no advisory council any longer, that they have resigned.

Again, we have no Cabinet Committee statute and there is no community input at all that has been delegated to them to really provide them with direction and guidance as to the needs and aspirations of the community.

I think the recommendations made here by the number of organizations are pertinent and point out to the fact that when we talk about accountability, we cannot just—just like you, as Congressmen that have been elected from various geographical districts, your accountability to your constituency back home, that is the accountability that we also want, of the group that is supposed to represent our needs and our aspirations at a national level and especially in the White House.

We want them to be accountable to us if they are representing us and our best interests, and at the same time, they not only represent us, but they have input coming in from the national and local leaders, and that is why it is imperative that these two bodies, the Committee itself, should the Committee continue, either be changed, mandated to have those meetings, and at the same time that the advisory council of the local citizens be extended and be geographically designed to allow as much input and be designated a number of meetings that would be held by those groups.

Again, this would provide the accountability of the Committee itself, and I feel that there has not been accountability as explained already.

I sincerely hope that this accountability is also that they are going to represent our interests just as you will represent our interests that we do not want another buffer area to our needs. And we are delegating to another agency to tell—our people have gone to Congressmen and said, well why do you not go to the Cabinet Committee for that assistance, that is what we designed it for.

Many of the Congressmen have responded in that manner. Again, we have gone to agencies and they have said to go to the Cabinet Committee, and again the authorities and all those things are not there, but it is used as an example not to assist us.

I think that in areas of legislation and areas of program design, it is a responsibility of each agency to design and develop programs to adequately meet the needs of all people including ours, which we are not in most cases.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

By the same token, in areas of legislation, it is the responsibility of the legislative to enact legislation that will be beneficial to everyone, including us. Not the Cabinet Committee or a group, but the elected, responsible persons that have been appointed on an elected basis to office to do these things for us so that in essence when we set up a committee or a group and say that it will be your committee, so leave us alone on these other areas and go to them for that kind of assistance. That is not what we want.

We want to make the agencies more responsive to our needs. Civil rights and civil right laws, you know, that we know that they have been inadequate. The Civil Rights Commission came out with the fact that many—one of the members resigned because of the Government's inability to enforce those laws.

How can we have an agency with no enforcement powers to enforce the laws?

By the same token, there should be some mandate to take care of not only the selection criteria of the officers of the Committee, but I think that the community should have some say-so as to who is going to be appointed to share that position, that the Spanish-speaking communities have a say-so as to who it is.

They are representing our interest.

I do not purport to allow anyone who has not been elected by me or have I had any say-so to appoint him as our leader. We want our input to be heard and to be known that that is a person that we desire or do not desire, as you are elected in your districts or in your constituencies.

That is the essence of my remarks.

Mr. EDWARDS. We are delighted to have heard from you.

Would the gentleman on the end identify himself?

Mr. MAY. I am K. W. May, and I am a staff assistant to Mr. William P. Vasquez.

Mr. EDWARDS. We welcome you too.

Ms. FRANKEL. I would very much like to underscore one of Mr. Fierro's comments, and it is one that I made earlier, and that is that we are seeking accountability not only from the Cabinet Committee for opportunities for Spanish-speaking people, but for anyone in the Federal Government whose responsibility it is to respond to our needs.

I thoroughly agree.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Parker?

Mr. PARKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I have been reading over the charge, the statute written by Congress, and as I understand it, the purpose it states very clearly is that the purpose of the Cabinet Committee is to assure that the Federal programs are reaching all Spanish speaking and providing the assistance that they need, and I understand part of your criticism being that when the functions were then outlined, they used the word advise and that there is no statutory authority to assure anything written into a law. Is that at least one of you, criticisms?

Mr. ZERMENO. Yes, basically, how do you measure advice?

Mr. PARKER. What you are really suggesting then is that the law has to be written so that if you give them a charge to assure something, they actually have the authority to do something.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The other business that I was wondering about is, have you as representatives of your organizations that you represent, to your knowledge, been solicited for any kind of advice or input over the past few years from the Cabinet Committee as to what the problems you feel there are?

Ms. FRANKEL. Well, I would respond for the two organizations that I work for, and one of them of course, is the Spanish-speaking Coalition. This is a very new organization. We are just getting off the ground, as a matter of fact.

I do believe that there was some contact about a possible appearance here. I cannot speak for Mr. Flores, since he is in California. Beyond that I do not know.

As far as I know, there have been no official requests.

Mr. ZERMENO. I should state that we have had communication with the Cabinet Committee and its staff—the staff, not the Cabinet Committee itself.

We have had numerous conversations over the past couple of years regarding various program areas throughout the Government. Yes, we have had that communication.

Mr. PARKER. Was that communication initiated by your organization or by the Cabinet Committee?

Mr. ZERMENO. I would say that it is 50-50 at this point. We go to them and they have asked us sometimes.

Mr. VASQUEZ. We, as well, have gone to the Cabinet Committee and at some times have only been asked to come in on matters on communications that we have been trying to work out in Latin communications for Spanish speaking, but we have gone to them.

Mr. PARKER. I have no further questions.

Mr. EDWARDS. It seems to me, that out of this discussion this morning and the excellent testimony that has been submitted, that there are certain areas of agreement by all the witnesses with regard to the Cabinet Committee.

The first, of course, being—and I think it is unanimous—that the Committee should be reauthorized but that it should do a better job in the years to come, that accountability is a theme that runs through all of the testimony, of the community, the Spanish-speaking community.

First of all, that this Puerto Rican community has not had its own leadership, perhaps it has not been represented in an executive position in the Cabinet; is that correct?

Mr. VASQUEZ. Fairly correct, sir.

Mr. EDWARDS. And in the Chicano community, that representatives, Chicano leaders on a nonpartisan basis have not been included in the decisionmaking of the Cabinet Committee.

Mr. ZERMENO. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think that we in Congress can testify that there has not been real accountability to Congress. The statute requires an annual report. The first report that I read in 1971 was in great detail, and the 1972 report was just a few pages and gave us no information whatsoever, and I think that reports are important.

It is the only way that we can tell what is being done. There is a real fear that the decentralization that has to do with revenue sharing is going to result in further handicaps to Spanish-speaking people

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

throughout the United States unless there is diligent oversight, especially of the civil right aspects of revenue sharing.

I might add as a sign of this, this subcommittee is very much concerned about that, and we will have our first hearing on this particular subject on July 30—July 27. We do not intend to allow billions of dollars of Federal money to be spent in communities of the United States and not require that Federal laws, with regards to the fair spending of this money are not enforced.

It would also seem to me that this Cabinet Committee, as Mr. Wiggins wisely pointed out, cannot be expected to thrive with $900,000, and perhaps its goals should be limited. We would rather have limited goals with achievement than wide goals with limited achievement, and this subcommittee has been very much interested in fair employment of Spanish-speaking people in the Federal Establishment, feeling that the Federal Establishment itself should be the model for the entire country.

We are not satisfied, you are not satisfied with the record today, with the 16-point program, and that is one area where the Cabinet Committee could perform an immense service not only with the civil organizations that you represent, but with this Committee and other governmental agencies and also with the Federal licensees of the Federal Government, such as the railroads, the banks, the savings and loans, the power companies, all of which are given monopoly jurisdiction in the United States by the Federal Government in return for which we expect them to have very fair employment practices, and promotion practices.

This subcommittee is always interested in the patterns and practices of discrimination against any minorities in the United States where we might be of assistance.

We are here for that purpose, to see whether or not and to insist that the various civil rights laws that this committee enacted over the past several decades be enforced. That is going to be really more helpful than anything else to the Spanish-speaking people in particular.

I am pleased that we really are having our first contact in several years with the Puerto Rican organizations. I am afraid that some of use from the West have had more to do with the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest than with the Spanish-speaking people of the East.

We are delighted that Mr. Rangel has been so interested in this problem and has made such a large contribution, but Mr. Vasquez it is a pleasure to have you here.

We are also concerned with the inadequacy of census data and that is one of the subjects that we are working on. But, I think, personally, that these hearings have been helpful. I know that I am going to present a statement, I believe, it is on Monday to Mr. Holifield's committee, the Government Operations Committee, recommending that the Cabinet Committee be authorized for another year, but suggesting some of those improvements that we have in mind.

I wonder if there is any further comment by any of the other members of the staff.

Mr. RANGEL. I would just hope that if your national organizations have any representatives in New York, it would be very helpful that

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

you forward to me their names so that we can assist in the organization's job, which is, I think, needed for all of us to be effective.

Mr. EDWARDS. It really is a two-way communication that has to take place. We cannot do too much unless we know what is going on. We try to keep up, but it is not the easiest thing in the world. Again, to all the witnesses, the committee thanks you very much.

Is there anything further that anybody would like to say today?

Mr. FERNÁNDEZ. I think that one of the things that we talked about is the 16-point program. I would like to make some reference to a number of the appointments.

I think that we are very proud of Mr. Phillips going to—being appointed an Ambassador—Mr. Sanchez, I mean. But again, he does not do anything for our own people in this country. When we have no wine jobs, people of responsibility except in one position, and that is Mr. Alex Armendariz, that is the only position that a Spanish-speaking person has in the present administration with any authority, any program moneys, and resources, to really effectively assist not only our own people, but people throughout that country, and when we talk about the 16-point program, these line jobs, they are not available.

Instead of creating an agency that has all Spanish-speaking people, with supergrades of GS 17's and 18's, we want agencies, we want them in line jobs, where they can make decisions and really help our point.

Civil rights laws, as Mr. Rangel pointed out, civil rights laws and EEOC regulations, so long as we do not have Spanish-speaking people in those positions, they will not be enforced. Out of the 80-some 16-point representatives, there are about 40 Spanish-speaking people; 40 out of 80, you know, that are directors of the 16-point program.

Well, it stands to reason to us that the longer that we are not in those elected positions, we are not going to be represented to the fullest extent, but I would like to point out the inadequacy of the appointed officials and elected officials in our Government today.

Mr. EDWARDS. Thank you, very much.

Mr. WIGGINS. I have something to say that is somewhat apropos to the gentleman's comment.

Three days ago in the the Washington Post, I read an article that I gather was based upon the Civil Service Commission's dealing with the appointment of members of minority groups.

The thrust of the article was that there had been a great increase in the employment of all minorities.

My recollection is that one third of all the new positions within a certain category were filled by minorities. We have not had anything official from the Civil Service Commission with respect to their recent data and maybe the staff could get the basis of that newspaper article.

If it turns out to be correct, maybe it could be included in the record.

Mr. ZAMENO. Those are District of Columbia figures. I wish that they were nationally.

Mr. EDWARDS. I think that the Spanish-speaking figure was 30 percent, maybe 3.1 percent. I think that at this time I would like unanimous consent to insert in the record, the recommendations made by IMAGE at their national convention on July 6 and 7 in Phoenix with regard to the 16-point program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The IMAGE is a Spanish-speaking organization concerned with Government employment and it met in Phoenix. The Chair was pleased to be invited to speak there, and did speak there.

I would like to put this in the record without objection.

IMAGE

(A Spanish-Speaking Organization Concerned with Government Employment)

SIXTEEN-POINT PROGRAM STATUS

This is an IMAGE evaluation of a Civil Service Commission 16-Point Program Study and Status Report.

The study findings have been prepared in three separate reports dealing with the three levels of assessment: (1) progress as reported by the Civil Service Commission regional offices; (2) as reported by agency headquarters; (3) as reported by Commission personnel management advisors on review of 77 field installations. The Commission Synopsis gives a general overview of the problems and implementation of the 16-Point Program.

This IMAGE synopsis attempts to give an overview of each of the three reports.

A. REGIONAL OFFICE REPORTS

1. Lack of guidance and follow-up: The majority of federal agencies have provided little or no guidance on the implementation of the 16-Point Program from their headquarters to field installations. The 16-Point Program has a lack of urgency and a low priority, and the lack of meaningful and specific guidance from agency headquarters has led many agencies and local installations to interpret for themselves the applicability of the 16-Point Program to their organizations. Much of the guidance furnished consisted of mere transmittal memoranda to which was attached the White House release announcing the 16-Point Program. Other agencies relied to a great extent on the guidance furnished by the CSC in their bulletin.

2. Federal agencies claim that budgetary restrictions, budget cutbacks, reductions in force, ceiling restrictions, restrictions on average grade, and emphasis on grade de-escalation have hampered or postponed implementation of the 16-Point Program.

3. The majority of agencies felt that mention of minorities in their EEO Plans of Action was all-inclusive and there is little concern on the lack of specificity in the plans of action in the implementation of the 16-Point Program. In the majority of the EEO Plans there is no mention of activities which would meet the specific needs of the Spanish Speaking and meet the objectives of the 16-Point Program.

4. San Francisco and New York regions report that a rift among minorities has resulted in a reluctance on the part of agencies to widely publicize the 16-Point Program for fear of criticism or complaints from other minority groups. (In California there are 280,632 governmental employees of which the Spanish Speaking comprise 5.9%, and Blacks 14.8%. In New York there are 168,691 governmental employees of which the Spanish Speaking comprise 3.9%, and Blacks 18.8%—1971 survey.)

5. There is an inability among agencies to guarantee certification of Spanish origin persons through the use of bilinguality as a selective factor. The agencies lack the skill, knowledge, or imaginative personnel to use the technique effectively, conduct interviews, or write justifications for selective certification. Another problem in this area is that a significant number of Spanish Speaking "singles" score high on the FSEE, thus reducing chances of reaching Spanish surnames through bilingual certification.

6. All regions report that they provided on-campus testing. The results were mixed with some reporting limited or negligible results and others reporting some increase of Spanish Speaking on CSC registers. A general assessment is that Spanish Speaking college students are not aware of federal opportunities and are not applying for the examination.

7. There have been 22 Spanish Speaking new hires nationwide as a result of the Cooperative Education Program, which is a very poor result. The Coopera-

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Five Job Search Programs have increased slightly because few agencies have indicated any interest.

5.8. There has been only minimal effort in the hiring of high school and college students for summer employment to give them an understanding of the federal Government that they could relate to their Spanish Speaking students. Agencies apparently fail to recognize that advantage of this hiring technique in providing a cadre of recruitment of Spanish persons.

9. Minimal actions have been taken to inform Spanish Speaking veterans of the availability of non-competitive appointments under the VRA program and have "canvassed" in 108 recruitments (.88%). Only three regions have reported hiring activity—Denver, Dallas, San Francisco.

10. Agency training activity on the 16 Point Program, in ongoing EEO training sessions, as reported, has been minimal. The reported training dealt with a few sessions on the Program at two regions with two to three agencies participating.

11. Agency contacts with community and Spanish Speaking organizations has increased, but appears to remain inadequate and greatly undeveloped. The contacts could be vehicles in identifying potential Spanish Speaking applicants, sponsoring agency training courses, and assisting the Spanish Speaking in applying for federal employment.

12. Some regions report their use of communications media to inform the Spanish Speaking populations in their areas of current employment opportunities in federal agencies but the statistical data demonstrates that few agencies use the media—and the majority do not use the public media to recruit Spanish Speaking.

During the past year of the Program (11 70-11 71) *total* federal employment increased by 2,295 jobs, while Spanish Speaking employment increased 1,268 jobs. Despite some gains in the work force, the overall Spanish Surnamed representation remained at 2.0% (from a previous 2.8%; 38% of this increase occurred in Grades 13 through 18, and 62% occurred in Grades 1 through 8. There was an overall reduction in the number of Spanish Speaking supergrades (GS-16 thru GS-18) presently. According to CSC records there has been an increase of three-tenths of a percent (.3%) of Spanish Speaking federal employees since the 16 Point Program was announced in November, 1969.

In order to reach a fair representative figure of federal government employees for the Spanish Speaking with respect to its population, at least 75,000 more jobs should be held by Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and other Latins. There are 70,717 Spanish Surnamed employees out of 2,573,770 federal employees.

B. CONSOLIDATION OF AGENCY REPORTS

1. Findings (cont'd)

5.9. Many agencies have not yet fully assessed their employment situation in relation to the Spanish Surnamed, nor have they developed overall plans to take corrective action where improvement is needed.

5.10. Many agencies have not made affirmative efforts to utilize "entry" programs such as the VRA, the Cooperative Education Program and the worker-trainee program to employ the Spanish surnamed.

5.11. Some agencies have found that bilingual selective certification is not always appropriate, that Spanish Surnamed candidates will be referred. Without affirmative recruiting efforts on their part to insure that Spanish Surnamed eligibles are referred, this situation will continue.

5.12. Some agencies claim there is a continuing absence of large numbers of qualified Spanish Surnamed candidates on CSC registers for substantive professional and technical jobs.

5.13. Some agencies claim that operating managers are often reluctant to fill positions at the lower supervisory levels, thereby passing up opportunities to employ persons who may not qualify for the next higher level but are qualified for lower levels.

2. Progress of the Program

While actions have not been numerous enough to significantly increase Spanish Surnamed employment in general, the minimal success of some agencies are indicative of potential larger results if outlined recruitment efforts are applied on a wider scale.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Support of the 16-Point Program

Headquarter Guidance—Most departments and agencies have issued various kinds of policy statements to subordinate agency units and field offices in support of the 16-Point Program. However, the statements have not included specific guidance outlining how to effectively implement the program. The Department of Interior alone conducted an in-depth analysis of their Spanish Speaking work force, identified their problem areas and called these to the attention of their field staff.

Some agencies, i.e., HEW, VA, and Labor Department, have appointed Spanish Surnamed coordinators for the 16-Point Program. However, responsibility for the program in some agencies has been placed in the Office of Personnel, which has caused problems in defining a role for the EEO staff in administering the program.

Program policy statements varied in several ways:

1. *Level of issuance.*—Initial policy statements were issued by some agencies at the Secretary or equivalent level and by others at the Director of Personnel or EEO level.

2. *Extent of guidance.*—The Department of Interior issued extensive guidance while the majority of agencies did not evaluate their Spanish Surnamed employment situation and did not point out identified problems to their field offices.

The sense of urgency that prompted the establishment of the 16-Point Program was somehow lost in the transmittal to field offices.

Little follow-up was initiated to assure affirmative implementation of the program. A few agencies (VA, Interior, Justice) did require their field offices to report periodically on actions taken to implement the program.

4. Revision of EEO Action Plans

In response to Point II of the Program, most agencies did review their Affirmative Action plans to assure full applicability to the special emphasis of the 16-Point Program. The majority of agencies have revised their plans in varying degrees to include items of the 16-Point Program. Some agencies maintain that their Affirmative Action plans are responsive to the needs of all minorities and have not revised their plans to include mention of the 16-Point Program (Interior, Air Force, PS, DOT, AEC).

Some agencies have adopted the principle of goals and timetables in areas where problems have been recognized. Few agencies, with the exception of Navy, Justice, HEW, DSA, have issued specific guidelines on the establishment of numerical goals of the Spanish Speaking. The other agencies while recommending that goals and timetables be established where feasible, have not issued specific guidelines on the extent of the goals to be established.

5. Program Awareness in EEO staffs

With few exceptions, agencies have not added Spanish Surnamed staff members to their headquarters civil rights and EEO offices. Although a number of agencies have appointed Spanish Surnamed 16-Point Program coordinators, these have usually been placed in other personnel offices or at the special assistant level. Agencies adding Spanish Surnamed staff members to their civil rights and EEO offices at the headquarters level have been AEC, DOT, VA, GSA, and Interior. In most of these agencies, however, these appointments have been at the GS-13/14 level. Of the 70 persons designated 16-Point Program coordinators in Federal agencies, only 13 are Spanish Surnamed; less than ten are full time coordinators. The majority of agencies, however, have minimal Spanish Surnamed representation in their field civil rights or EEO offices.

6. Training in support of Program

The majority of agencies have not conducted special training sessions to orient managers and supervisors in the objectives of the 16-Point Program. In most cases, consideration of the Program has been included in overall training courses on equal employment opportunity. Few agencies have held special training sessions for the purpose of learning more about the Program and how to implement it effectively (Interior, GSA, HEW, AEC).

7. Significant Problems

The following are problems encountered by agencies:

a) Budget restrictions, budget cuts, work force reductions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

(b) Civil Service examinations are still presenting barriers for Spanish Surnamed persons. Few Spanish Surnamed professionals, technicians, and executives are being convinced to enter their names on CSC registers unless a definite vacancy exists. As a result, CSC registers often do not include Spanish Surnamed eligibles at all or when they do appear on FSEE registers, they do not have enough scores to be selected for federal employment.

(c) Operating managers often insist on recruiting for journeyman level candidates without consideration for establishing trainee or sub-journeyman positions.

(d) There is a need to fully inform the Spanish Speaking community of all job vacancies and especially of those jobs which do not require a college degree. It is insufficient to merely mail announcements to leaders of organizations.

(e) Bilingual selective certification has failed to assure the referral of Spanish Surnamed eligibles. The failure of the SF 171 to indicate the ability to communicate with the Spanish Speaking populace being served rather than a measure of language proficiency, has allowed many non-Spanish Surnamed applicants with some knowledge of the Spanish language to be included on bilingual certificates.

C. REPORT OF THE ANALYSIS AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION

The CSC conducted special reviews of actions taken in support of the 16-Point Program for Spanish Surnamed at 77 federal field installations in 1972. The majority of reviews were conducted throughout the United States with concentration in areas with significant Spanish Surnamed population (California, Texas, Colorado, New York, Florida) and the top 12 federal agencies were reviewed, i.e., HEW, DOT, SBA, etc.

(a) Of 55,155 GS employees located at the installations surveyed, 3,260 (5.9%) were Spanish Surnamed. In professional, technical, and administrative positions at GS-9 or above, 970 SSAs were employed (3.6%). Spanish Surnamed employees made up 17.8% of blue-collar (WG) employment (2,165 of 12,313) at the same installations. In skilled trades and labor positions 15.6% were Spanish Surnamed. Analysis of trends in employment at these 77 installations indicated gradual increases in Spanish Surnamed employment in GS positions overall, and slight declines in lower level WG positions.

Of all major agencies reviewed in this study, only HEW showed large gains in SSA employment. Department of the Army installations surveyed showed a significant decrease. All other agencies reviewed appeared to have maintained a relatively constant level of Spanish Speaking employment, or showed a mild gain.

(b) *Headquarter leadership.*—Guidance and direction from higher headquarters on the 16-Point Program was deficient in terms of timeliness, specificity and follow-through in nearly two-thirds (2/3) of installations surveyed. Only 24 (31%) of the installations surveyed had received effective and timely guidance on the 16-Point Program from higher headquarters. Another 27 (35%) of the installations reviewed had received general information from agency headquarters on the program, but little or nothing in the way of direction in how to proceed. Another 26 (34%) of installations reviewed had no record of ever receiving headquarters guidance on the 16-Point Program.

Indications of headquarters follow-through and evaluation of implementation of the 16-Point Program in the field were limited. Aggressive headquarters follow-up on field activities' progress was not in evidence.

(c) *Management Action at the Local Level.*—Management involvement and activity in the 16-Point Program at the local level appears to be growing, but systematic planning and evaluation by management was lacking at three-fourths of the installations surveyed. Program activity and information was primarily centered in staff offices rather than in line management channels. In some cases, managers viewed the program as a personnel office activity, and as such, secondary to basic operations.

Management understanding of the special problems of the Spanish Surnamed appeared to be adequate at 23 (30%) of installations visited. At another 14 (18%) of the installations, managers appeared to have some limited knowledge of the basis of the 16-Point Program.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Management understanding of the special problems of the Spanish Surnamed was clearly inadequate at 40 (52%) of the installations surveyed. The problem arises because information received locally often stayed within personnel and equal employment opportunity staff offices and the lack of guidance from agency headquarters. Local efforts to increase managerial and supervisory understanding of the needs of SSAs were underway at 22 (29%) of the 77 installations.

Systematic efforts at the local level to develop objectives and plans of action for improving opportunities for Spanish Surnamed have been rare. Most of the installations reviewed had not yet set out specific plans for program implementation.

Goals and timetables for employment of the SSAs had been established in only 12 (16%) of the installations. Though positive efforts to recruit SSAs were being made in many installations, little action had been taken to actually assess the employment situations in terms of Spanish Surnamed representation as a basis for such efforts. Some installations had established employment goals on the basis of parity with local SSA population without regard to the availability of skills in this segment of the labor market.

(d) Recruitment Activities.—Employment and budget restrictions, including reductions in force had greatly curtailed recruitment activities at many installations during 1971. Established staffing practices in many agencies continued to restrict opportunities for SSAs and other persons with limited education and job experience. Only 11 (14%) of the 77 installations visited were aggressively recruiting SSAs.

A total of 1,146 college graduates had been employed by installations surveyed during 1971. Nine percent (124 1,146) were SSAs. Seventeen (17) installations (42%) had utilized Spanish Surnamed recruiters in campus contacts.

Although there was good recognition of the benefits of the College Cooperative Education program as a recruitment device, and the fact that it permitted eventual entry without necessity of the FSEE written test, the program had not been utilized extensively.

(e) Selective Placement Based on Spanish Speaking.—Thirty-nine (50%) of the installations were able to identify public contact positions in which it would be useful to have persons with Spanish Speaking ability, and 35 of these installations had filled the majority of the positions with Spanish Speaking persons. Only 25 of these installations had made requests to Commission examining offices for selective certification of eligibles having Spanish Speaking ability or had utilized this ability as a formal selective factor in internal placement actions. At only ten (10) installations reviewed, special efforts to recruit Spanish Speaking persons for appropriate public contact positions were evident. Five installations had specific provisions in their merit promotion programs for selective placement based on Spanish Speaking ability.

Mr. Edwards. Thank you, again.

The subcommittee stands adjourned.

[The subcommittee adjourned at 11:35.]